

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF LONDON.

AN ANGLO - NORMAN METRICAL "BRUT" OF THE
FOURTEENTH CENTURY

(British Museum Ms
Egerton 3028)

1937

VERNON
PHILIP
UNDERWOOD:

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

AN ANGLO-NORMAN METRICAL "BRUT" OF THE 14th CENTURY.

(British Museum Ms Egerton
3028)

BYNOPSIS

<u>Introduction</u>	I, The Manuscript	page 1
	Description of ms (1), date (5), miniatures (6) related ms (12)		
	II, Locality of Origin	18
	Influence of English on Anglo- Norman (18), orthographical feat- ures (25), historical (35).		
	III, The "Brut".	42
	Comparison with other texts (42), methods of abridgment (48), addit- ions (55), sources (58), possible successor (63).		
	IV, The Chronicle	65
	Unreliability (65), treatment of contemporary events (73), author's tendencies (74).		
	V, Language	78
	Phonetics (78), orthography (89), morphology (100), syntax (125), vocabulary (131).		
	VI, Versification	136
	Observance of French rules (136), irregularity (140), opinions on Anglo- Norman versification (148), aim of changes in Wace (155), possible Eng- lish influence (159), alliteration (162), enjambement (164), rhyme (165).		
<u>Text</u>	175
<u>Notes</u>	239
<u>Glossary</u>	241
<u>Index of Proper Names</u>	242
<u>Bibliography</u>	249
<u>Index</u>	250

INTRODUCTION

I. THE MANUSCRIPT

The British Museum ms Egerton 3028 contains:

- (a) part of an abridgment of the Brut of Wace, with a continuation into the reign of Edward III (ff. 1 to 63 inclusive);
- (b) a version of the Destruction de Rome, in similar style of writing, miniatures and language, (ff. 64-83);
- (c) a version of the Roman de Fierabras, also in similar style (ff. 84-118).

It was acquired by the Museum in 1920 from a member of the Cornish family Pendarves, to which it had evidently passed by inheritance from the library of one of the Luttrells, of Dunster Castle, Somerset. Narcissus Luttrell, annalist and antiquarian, who died in 1732, inscribed his elaborate monogram, supposed to contain all the letters of his name, on the verso of the present first folio, with the date 1693. On the recto, in a hand which seems his, we read: "A Cronicle of England called Brutus in Frenche verse." Above the miniature on the verso of f. 63 is the inscription in an earlier hand, mutilated by subsequent

trimming; "La Espagne Sarazin et Fierenbras son fils en le temps du Charlemayne." In the same hand on f. 83 verso, opposite the beginning of the Fierabras proper, we read: "La Romance de fierenbras d'Alisandre fils de Laban d'Espagne."

Written on vellum, in single column, the ms is of small format (19,5 x 12cm), reduced from its original size by the trimming noted above, possibly done when the nineteenth-century binding was put on. A miniature depicting some incident related in the text occupies roughly half of the recto of each folio except ff. 65 and 85, both of which follow next but one after a full-page picture at the beginning of the Destruction and the Fierabras. The writing is a rather elaborate English hand of about the middle of the fourteenth century, and is on the whole careful; it is well preserved, apart from six lines at the top of the first folio, and a number of words here and there which are effaced by stains due to the gilding of the miniatures. In these cases the apparently correct reading is given in the copy of the text.

Larger initials in red, of fairly ~~constant~~ frequent occurrence, divide the work into paragraphs; they have

been forgotten in three places, (vv. 1209, 1691, 834) though in the last case a small v (the missing letter), of the size and colour of the ordinary text, has been inserted in the middle of the space left. Numerals are generally in Roman characters, and the frequent abbreviations are quite of normal type: 9, as is shown by occasional full spellings, represents cum or cun; gn^ut, gn^at, kn^ut, kn^at, qn^ut, qn^at, all occur, but as graunt, kuant, quant, seldom appear in full, these abbreviations have been rendered grant, kant gant. This course seems ^{further} justified by the fact that relatives are invariably written ai, ki, ge, ke, and that aun is ~~v~~ rare in this text. I and j are as a rule carefully indicated by a small flourish above, and fondness is shown for flourishes, ornamented final letters of a line and so on. The inverted semi-colon (;) occurs frequently, generally in proximity to direct speech, after "dist il" etc. The writer is also partial to a left hand marginal sign consisting of two ~~xxxx~~ parallel inclined dashes; these often seem to mark off paragraphs, sense-groups, or sentences, but they also occur frequently

where it is difficult to explain their function.

The ms is incomplete. It begins with the end of Cymbeline's reign, corresponding to v. 5,000 of Wace's Brut, (ed. Le Roux de Lincy). or v.4,883 of the edition ~~being~~ made by ^{Prof. I} ~~Prof.~~ F. Arnold. The British Museum Catalogue of Additions to the Department of Manuscripts 1916 - 1920 therefore suggests that it lacks five gatherings of eight leaves, or about 2,080 lines. Over 10,000 lines of Wace are here abridged into 2,914 lines, with an additional 354 lines bringing the "history" up to the time of the ms.

The fragment begins on the present f.2, and the six effaced lines on f. 1. will not be found till v. 387 of our text. This arises from a bad assembly of the ms at some stage of its history, probably when the first part of the Brut, and perhaps the original binding, were lost. F.1. should take the place of f. 8, which should follow f.2, really the beginning of our fragment. The catchwords at the ~~beginning~~ foot of f.1. b then come in their correct place at the end of a gathering if, as suggested, a number of complete gatherings has been lost. This disarrangement is evidently of ancient date, as the present f. 1. bears

5

every sign of long wear, presumably without fly-leaf or binding.

The value of the ms from a literary and philological viewpoint is increased by the tolerable certainty with which it can be dated.

The writing, from comparison with dated documents in such manuals as English Court Hand, (Johnson and Jenkinson), seems to belong to the latter part of the first half of the fourteenth century. The concluding lines refer to the reign of Edward III "qe ore est." The king has already begun his invasion of French territory:

"Cil ad grant guerre ~~xxxix~~ comencé ...
Encuntre le Roi de France en sa terre."

The date of composition should therefore be subsequent to July 1338, when Edward and his forces landed at Antwerp. If "en sa terre" is not used loosely ~~for~~ of Flanders, it should date in fact from Edward's actual crossing of the French frontier at Buironfosse late in 1339. The ms ends with a prayer for victory such as aggressors usually elicited from their churches, but there is no mention of the king's great naval victory at Sluys on June 25th 1340. As such an event would not doubt have found a large place in the patriotic ending of the poem it is natural to conclude that Sluys had not been won when the ms was

written, or at least composed. The limiting dates for composition therefore appear to be July 1338 and June 1340. That given by the Catalogue for the conclusion of the chronicle, (1338) thus seems rather early, and the evidence most favourable to the end of 1339 or the beginning of 1340. As the writing seems contemporary with the latest facts recorded, it is more than possible that the scribe was also the author of the chronicle. Obscure lines and downright errors, as distinct from irregularities regular in Anglo-Norman, are very few, and the quality of the versification which follows the end of Wace's story hardly suggests talent likely to be rare in a scribe.

The miniatures have great curiosity value, as well as artistic and historical interest. Comparison with the fine work of many contemporary English artists seems to justify the comment of the Catalogue, "they are not beautiful but very interesting." Closer examination, however, shows in them rare skill in drawing and composition, and it is rather the crude colouring which conveys an unfavourable first impression. Professor Focillon's opinion is that they are of great excellence, in fact unique. They seem to have been intended originally as pen-and-ink drawings. The

7

drawing is firm and clean, the drapery well rendered, and ignorance of proportion and perspective is only a common fault of the time. Some of the pictures, for example the scenes of fighting such as those on ff. 5 and 18, are particularly good and full of action. The faces of the men, with their wavy noses, the interrogative arc of the brow and the rather thick lips faintly curved in a smile or distressfully drawn, as occasion demands, are of a uniform ugliness which is at least distinctive.

The colouring and gilding, however, are much below the standard of the drawing. Hair and beards are usually a rusty purple, though some yellowish blonds appear, and even one or two bluebeards, notably Joseph, in the Nativity on f.2. The flat washes of dirty blue, reddish-brown, orange, yellow or dull green rarely keep within the outlines, and often obliterate interior drawing intended to show drapery, hair etc. This is so much the case that 24 pictures in the book, (e.g. ff. 7, 12, 30, 33, 82,) show lining-over above the pigment, in the same black ink which surrounds the gilding and detracts so much from the work left us by the excellent draughtsman who worked with brown ink. This lining-over evidently represents some attempt to make amends by the perpetrator

of the colouring and gilding. Traces of the original brown outlines, distinct from the clumsy black edging of ^{gilded} crowns, spear-heads, cups, etc., can be seen in half-a dozen or more pictures, (e.g. ff. 9, 15, 17, 32, 39). The gold has almost ~~disappeared~~ all disappeared, leaving only a dark mass, with a discoloration through to the text on the verso. All this gives the impression of a prentice hand different from that of the master of line responsible for the drawing.

The Catalogue gives (p. 338) a detailed list of the subjects of the miniatures. It suffices here to point out that they are all taken from the text of the actual page on which they occur, and that the artist's predilections appear to be for violence and gore: sixteen of the sixty-three illustrations to the Brut fall into this category. The spurring of the blood is irreproachably rendered, in a bright scarlet which contrasts favorably with the other dull colours and is no doubt the work of the original pen-artist; it is the same as that of the large initials. The artist shows especial fondness for royalty and heraldry, still a feature in the national character: nearly all his illustrations contain one or more kings, and a deal of what the Catalogue calls "imaginary

"heraldry." All kings of Britain, British, Saxon or Norman, bear the three leopards of Anjou. Frolle, Roman governor of Paris in the time of Arthur, carries on his shield, in common with Charlemagne, the lilies of France. Monarchs are easily distinguished by their crowns, of uniform pattern, which cling to the royal heads in all circumstances, even when these are gravitating after receiving a fatal stroke. Uther (f. 35) persists in wearing his royal badge when approaching Tintagel disguised as his ~~xxxx~~ vassal Gorlois. The baneful influence of these tarnished emblems on the text has been alluded to. The artist rarely misses the smallest opportunity of introducing ships: there are eight sea-pictures in the Brut, and twelve in the whole book. Other interesting subjects are : Uther's men trying to remove the Giants' Circle, mistakenly called in the Catalogue the erection of Stonehenge - the picture is clearly modelled on Stonehenge, however (f.30); Arthur's giant adversary, obvious ancestor of the pantomime variety (f. 49); men dying of the pestilence (f. 58); and Edward the Confessor's ~~xxxxxx~~ shrine at Westminster, with sufferers awaiting cure (f.59)

Other pictures beside f. 30 on which the Catalogue seems mistaken are:-

F.7. "Trahern and the King of Norway." It was of course Octaves who solicited that monarch's aid.

f. 27. "Hengist takes refuge in Coniborough."

The text tells us that Eldolf captured him before he reached the town; the incident portrayed is rather the overtaking of Hengist.

F. 31. "The king of Ireland's troops sail to aid Pascens" For the reason given in the next paragraph, it is more likely that Pascens' flight to Ireland is intended as mention of this immediately precedes the picture.

f. 45. "Arthur and Hoel discussing plans in a tower." The nearest mention of Hoel in the text is fifteen lines later. Arthur is haranguing all his barons in the Tour Gigantine and the picture comes at the point in his speech when he announces his intention of going to Rome "Pur treud aver, nun rur doner." The artist may indeed intend the only other personage visible beside Arthur to be Hoel, or he may be portraying Arthur's projected meeting with the Emperor.

F. 51. "Fight between Arthur and the Emperor." Neither Wace, nor our author mentions this combat. Such a ~~pic~~ *pièce de résistance* would certainly have been dealt with at length.

We have noted that the miniatures all portray incidents of the text. In fact, each miniature is invariably based, not only on what is related on the page where it occurs, but on the verse or verses immediately before it. This explains why the pictures occur in different parts of the page, with few, numerous or no verses above or below them. Thus the picture of Arviragus mounting

//

his horse (f.8) is at the extreme top of the page, as the relevant verse, "si rest sur sun destrer muntez," comes at the bottom of f.7b. As the Nativity at the top of f. 2 has no words above it, we may conclude that the last verse of the lost portion made allusion to the birth of Christ: v. 4991 of Wace (v. 4874, Arnold's edition) is in fact "A cel tans Jesus Crist nanqui."

Such correspondence between text and illustrations suggests at least close co-operation between scribe and illustrator, not only in fitting the illustration to the text, but in fitting the text around the illustration. The ink of the text and of the pen drawing is of the same brown hue, while the initials and the blood of the miniatures are of the same red. The following circumstance suggests something further.

Of the reign of Cariz Wace says:-

En son tans vint la grant sorvarse
De paiens et de gens averse
Que Guermans amena par mer;
Bien en avés oi parler. (vv. 13, 791 - 13,794;
ed. Arnold
vv 13379 - 13382)

The corresponding lines of the Egerton ms, at the foot of f. 53b, are:

En sun temps vint la grant suverse
Des paiens et de gent adverse
Ke Gurguint menast par Mer;
Ore le vous voil mustrer.

And after four lines ~~describing~~ describing the voyage to Britain, the miniature on f.54a depicts Gurguint and his

warriors tossing in their ship. Again, the last verse before the miniature at the foot of f. 21 a, "Vent ont bon; si ent singlez," is repeated with slight differences at the top of f. 21 b, "Vent unt bon, fort unt siglé." This seems to be a glimpse of our scribe at work. The oversight, it may be, occurred because he had paused to make his drawing before turning over. There could hardly be better evidence for identifying illustrator with scribe.

The Catalogue points out that the unique style of the miniatures is similar only to that of the "Hanover Provincial Library ms IV 578," containing the "Destruction ~~de~~ Egerton and Egerton, of which a notice, with phototypic reproduction of an opening, was given by Prof. Brandin in Romania, (xxviii, p. 489). L. Olschki, in "Manuscrits français à peintures des bibliothèques d'Allemagne," also gives ^{Hanover ms} reproductions. At the Courtauld Institute, London, only two 14th-century mss have miniatures showing points of resemblance with the Egerton ms. They are the Apocalypse (ms Papys 1803), at Magdalene College, Cambridge, and the IV Liber de Officiis Regum executed for Edward III after the East Anglian school, and dated 1326 (o.s.). The latter is at Christ Church, Oxford. Dr. Pevsner, of Göttingen, quoted by Ida Wirtz (Studien zur Handschrift IV 578), connects the style of the Hanover miniatures with East Anglia, and dates them about 1320-30. Those of the second

he says, show a different hand from the first, and are possibly modelled on the style of Matthew Paris, of about 1250-70. The British Museum experts, however, do not connect the Egerton miniatures with the well-known East-Anglian school. Of course, the existence by the 14th century of many travelling professional illuminators complicates the question of the origin of these miniatures. An attempt will be made in the next chapter to localise our ms on other evidence.

The resemblance of the Egerton miniatures particularly for the faces, with that reproduced from the Hanover ms, is very marked. The comparison gains in importance if carried further.

The Hanover ms similarly contains an average of one miniature per folio. Men's faces in the Romania reproduction are strikingly like those of the Egerton. The use of a banner pole as part of the right-hand border of a picture, with the banner itself projecting out beside the text, as seen on the final page of the Hanover Destruction is found eight times in the Egerton (ff. 47, 50, 74, 84, 89, 96, 97, 110). The last two lines above the final Destruction miniature, picturing Charlemagne's supper party are:

Charles le Roi de France sen ad leve demandee
Maintenant et tout sest assis au soper.

We have already noted the Egerton writer's habit of making the picture follow immediately the verse which it illustrates. Prof. Brandin speaks of the "mouvement, vivacité, variété" evidenced in the pictures of the Hanover Destruction, which, he believes with Dr. Plevner more recently, are not due to the same artist as those of Fierabras. He speaks of crude colouring and continues "L'enlumineur de A (Fierabras) nous fait sentir le moelleux des draperies, des costumes ou des voiles, ... se sert de dorures, ... le coloris peut avoir été fait postérieurement, ou par une autre main... Les deux enlumineurs serrent d'ailleurs le texte de très près, et leurs illustrations servent réellement à éclairer le poème qu'elles ornent." These remarks could hardly have been bettered for application to the Egerton miniatures. It may be added that, as far as can be judged from comparison of Prof. Brandin's list of the subjects of the Hanover pictures with those of the Egerton ms, at least fifteen subjects seem to be common to the two mss and of similar conception. Of course, the Egerton version of the stories being less full than the Hanover, and different, this number is less than it might otherwise have been. Ida Wirtz goes so far as to say: "von den 34 auf den Fierabras entfallen ^{den} Miniaturen der Egerton Handsch, 20 ein Gegenstück in unserer Hs. haben." She also says the ink of the Hanover ~~ms~~ is dark-brown, like that of the Egerton.

Consideration of the writing of the last page of the Hanover Destruction shows not only general likeness with that of the Egerton but also similar letter-forms and abbreviations. There is similar use of ornament such as the marginal // and the elaborate final r: the word "destrer" has the exact appearance which it takes more than once in the Brut. Spelling habits are also alike. Forms like coen, joi, voice, croice, bone vent, hanape, pier, (for pere), beal (fem.), puceal, gaitoent, naferer, estour, comencea, totes (masc.), and ceste (masc.) are common to both, while -eint is a frequent imperfect ending in both mss. Ida Wirtz also points out many similarities in the language and versification.

The dimensions of the Hanover ms are 23 x 14 cm., which compare with those of the Egerton, bearing in mind the extensive trimming undergone by the latter. The Destruction occupies 24 folios, and Eierabras 76 folios of the Hanover ms. The respective numbers for the Egerton are 19 and 34. Prof. Brandin gives the average number of lines in a full page of the former as 45, with 24 on pages containing miniatures. The figures for the Egerton Brut are 36 and 17. Groeber, in his Romania article, (ii, p. 6) says of the author of the Hanover Destruction; "Il n'a pas suivi très exactement son original; il a lui-même composé des vers.... s'est écarté dans ce cas des données du texte qu'il a eu sous les yeux." This applies with equal truth to the author of the Egerton Brut.

All this tempts one to suppose that the two mss are the products of the same school of scribes and illuminators, and issued from the same Anglo-Norman scriptorium, presumably a small one as these seem its only products known to survive, and remote from the well-known centres as its style is so much its own. Its scribes were apparently skilled in the illustrator's art as well as the writer's. They further seemed to be versifiers on their own account, considerably altering their models and composing extensive additions. The Brut, at any rate, appears to be autograph as far as the last part is concerned.

Prof. Brandin dates at before 1280 the writing of the Hanover Destruction and the Fierabras at the beginning of the 14th century. Tanqueray (*Evolution du Verbe*, p. xvii) dates the Destruction 1300-1330. The writing of the three sections of the Egerton ms, if not from the same hand at, for example, short intervals of time, appears to be almost contemporaneous. Rather curiously, considering its later date, it resembles most closely the earlier hand in the Hanover ms. Since the Brut dates itself with tolerable certainty, the Egerton Destruction and Fierabras should thus represent a mid-century recension of a work already, in the Hanover ms, executed some years earlier in the same monastery. We may even wonder whether the latter now lacks an original first part containing the Brut. If it never did include this, it would be interesting to conjecture what recrudescence of popularity

or other causes, led to the inclusion of this piece in the Egerton. It is perhaps not irrelevant to note that a fragment of Wace's Brut and the Roman de Fierabras are found together in the Paris ms no. 12603.

If there is indeed family relationship between the two mss, the presence of one of them at Hanover may find an explanation in the close connection of the Electorate with England for over a century from 1715. Nothing is known, however, even at the library to which ~~it~~ it belongs, about the history of the Hanover ms.

II LOCALITY OF ORIGIN

There are obvious difficulties in attempting to identify the place of origin of an Anglo-Norman text, except from direct evidence. It is common ground to say that each author followed his own sweet will in spelling and grammar, curbed only by the more or less of efficacy with which his teachers had instilled the rules of French as cultivated in England. That it was in more than one sense a cultivated language by the fourteenth century is shown by facts like the regulation necessary, in 1328, to ensure its use at Oriel, Oxford, or Edward III's 1334 ordinance encouraging Englishmen to have their children taught French, "par quoy il en fussent plus able et plus coustumier ens leur gheires," i.e. his aggression on France. O.F. Emerson, *et al.* (Romanic Review, 1916 p.133), claiming that Edward's courtiers spoke English and did not understand continental French, quoted Froissart's note of the artfulness of the English in turning their ignorance to account: "La nature des Engles est telle que tous jours il se orienment a estre deceu et repliquent tant apres une cose que marvelles; et ce que il aueront en couvenant un jour, il le delieront l'autre. Et a tout ce les encline a faire ce que il n'entendent point bien tous les termes dou langage de France; ne on ne lor scet comment bouter en la teste, se ce n'est tout dis a lor pourfit." Again, if English had not been the native language of the majority of his subjects, it would hardly have been worth the King's while to include among war propaganda

for preaching in the churches a pretended French plot to destroy the English nation and language. The great poet of his later reign, Chaucer, chose English ~~nation~~ and not French as the medium in which to win the King's favour and that of the public. It is certain, then, that by the fourteenth century the French language was not a native growth in England. There seem, however, to be several schools of thought as to the nature of this artificial language, all supported by quotations from contemporaries. Meyer, in his introduction to Bozon's Contes moralisés, explained the differences in Anglo-Norman writers: "Ce ne fut pas impunément que le français pénétra dans les classes inférieures d'une population accoutumée aux sons et aux formes d'un idiome tout différent. La langue qui s'était conservée dans un état de pureté relative jusqu'aux premières années d'Henri III dégénère rapidement avant le milieu du XIII^e siècle. Il ne semble pas qu'elle soit partout aussi uniforme que le dit Ranulph Higden (Polychronicon)... elle offre au contraire dans sa corruption une variété assez grande. Ce qui est vrai, c'est que les différences linguistiques qu'on observe d'un texte à un autre ne semblent pas correspondre, en général du moins, à des régions déterminées, mais dépendant du plus ou moins d'instruction des auteurs ou des copistes."

Prof. Studer (Study of Anglo-Norman, p.14) after quoting Higden, "cum tamen Normannica lingua, quae adventitia est, univoca maneat pene sunctos," adds the comment of John

Trevisa, Cornish vicar of Berkeley in Gloucestershire (c. 1385); "nevertheless there is as many dyvers manere Frensche in the reem of Fraunce as is dyvers maner Englischo in the reem of Engeland." The further remark quoted by Miss Pope (From Latin to Modern French, p. 422) - "for a man of Kente, southern, western and northern men speken Frensche al lyke in soum and speche, but they speken Frensche al lyke in sume and speche, but they speke not theyre Englyssh so," is not Trevisa's but Cantton's, so hardly constitutes contemporary evidence. Studer continues by urging that the language imposed by a conqueror is usually more uniform than that spoken in his own country, and that Meyer's opinion that there were in England numerous varieties of French needs revision: the most evident differences are only in spelling and are due to the introduction of Anglo-Saxon vowels. Prior declares (Romania, xlix) : "Norman French changes and evolves at the same time and in the same way as English. It even follows the dialectal variations in the population, and the Anglo-Norman of the North differs from that of the South or West." To his support comes the oft-quoted author of Edward the Confessor (c. 1245): "language par pais varie." Individual fancy or ability (or lack of it), fundamental homogeneity with superficial spelling differences, or variation with English dialect-~~regions~~ regions, thus, seem the chief possible explanations of the obvious lack of uniformity between Anglo-Norman texts.

In a conflict of authorities it is difficult to find truth. Perhaps, however, a more or less homogeneous French was used by lawyers and taught by schools all over the country, conforming, as far as standardisation could go, to the conventions of Marlborough or Strafford-aft-Howe. Once removed from pedagogic restraint, however, individual exponents no doubt insensibly developed and wrote their own version of French. Did this spring merely from phantasy and ignorance as Meyer thought when he seemed to reject the evidence "language par pais Varie"? Such a conclusion was natural if he was looking for dialect regions of French. The occurrence in the same author of both archaic and highly-evolved forms, with apparent traits of numerous continental dialects, is enough to defeat attempts at classification on this basis. But instead of dialects or sub-dialects of French, should we not see rather a more or less homogenous French influenced by different dialects of English? Suchier's pioneer attempt at chronological and regional ~~xxxxxx~~ classification of Anglo-Norman mss rested on this assumption. If we can, in part at least, localise a ms by the forms of its place-names, as Prof. Brandin showed in Fouke Fitz Warin, we are tacitly acknowledging the influence of the scribe's local dialect on his spelling of some of the words he uses. Why should he not also betray, in the spelling of his school French, traces of the English dialect he spoke and heard around him, in greater proportion as his proficiency in the acquired language was less?

Prof. Prior suggested in "Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts"

and in Romania, that English dialect phenomena, rather than French ones lay at the root of some Anglo-Norman orthography. This ought to be true at least of writings after 1250, by which date English is once more a literary language popular in Layamon's version of the Brut. Jewish immigrants are taking English and not French names, and foreign prelates are learning English. This is important, not so much as a sign of the preponderance of an English-speaking laity, as of an English-speaking lower clergy, with which the bishops would be in more immediate contact. That English literature surviving from the 12th century is largely homiletic^{ic} is surely significant. The monastic orders were no doubt anglicised later than the seculars, and probably, with their international character, French speaking or bilingualism persisted longer in the monasteries than elsewhere. But the French of monks for the most part isolated and working amid an Anglo-Saxon peasantry, and with a growing number of native Englishmen among them as the Constitutions of Clarendon became inoperative, could not fail in time to be modified just as much, or more, by the language spoken all around, as by the successive waves of Angevins, King John's loyalists, Pierre des Roches' Poitevins and Eleanor's Provençals, relatively few in number after all, and frequenting court rather than cloister.

The books they produced would soon register such

modifications. When the same writers began to be engaged on books in English as well as in French, English habits of pronunciation and sound-notation would no doubt show in their French works, and vice versa, as those were not yet days of exalted nationalism. This would be even more true of the professional lay scribes, numerous by the beginning of the 14th century: their contact with the English-speaking population would be even closer.

Such facts as the diphthongising of certain vowels while on the other hand a number of diphthongs were simplified have been assumed to prove continental ^{influences.} But, as Prof. Prior urged, it cannot be forgotten that diphthongising was, and is still, a marked characteristic of English, together with a contrary process of simplification which turned a number of Anglo-Saxon diphthongs into Middle English simple vowels. No one seems to have investigated the possibility that the change of many Anglo-Norman -er infinitives to -ier or -ir may have been helped by the analogy of English infinitives in -i.

Again, the constitutional difficulty which English speakers had, and have, in pronouncing certain French sounds has been noted at work in Anglo-Norman by Prof. Tanqueray (*Evolution du verbe* pp. 751, 790.). To admit this difficulty, however, at once established the influence of the English pronunciation-habits: as there was not yet

a standard speech, this is tantamount to admitting the influence of English dialects. This would no doubt be more marked in some dialect regions than in others, just as we find to-day that certain French vowels, for example, are easier for Northerners than Southerners, whose vowels are less pure and more liable to be diphthongs. May not this difficulty, with other English speech habits and dialectal traits, account for a number of phenomena whose origin is unsolved, or which have been placed to the account of French dialects of which it is sometimes difficult to trace historically any widespread contact with England? Fourteenth-century authorities like Higden and Robert of Gloucester agree that even "uplandish men" are at pains to acquire social distinction by learning French. What stronger influence therefore, would lie behind the tendencies of Anglo-Norman than that of the English dialect-speaking majority who for social, commercial, military or legal reasons strove with the divers "maneres de language" compiled for their learning? Those tendencies are still ~~stark~~ disconcertingly alive in the French of learners at many an English school beside that of Stratford-atte-Bowe. The English pronunciation of Latin, until recent "reform" efforts at least, shows what a fate awaited the French of England had it survived as a pedagogic tradition removed from the influence of the living language.

In the actual texts, there is great superficial dissimilarity, for example, between the forms found in Pierre de Langtoft, his contemporary the author of Fouke Fitz Warin, and the present piece. Pierre can be pinned down to Yorkshire; if he, or a scribe of his district, is responsible for the spelling of ei as ai found throughout his Chronicle, (ray, curtaysment, bayvre, etc.), this is quite in accord with Northern English phonology. Pierre's French is all through much more barbarous, though earlier, than that of the Egerton ms. The North, then, seems excluded as the latter's place of origin. In the East, at this very time (1338), Robert of Brunne was bringing out a Brut in English. We should expect the Egerton ms to originate from a region of stronger French tradition than either of these.

Examination of the proper nouns shows double vowel letters in Baathe, (v. 2613) Boos (2614) and Looth, (1888 et al.) uo for o in Suongoastre (984, 988); a for Anglo-Saxon or Welsh ae in Exile (2053) in Adilstan (2935), Alvered (2978) and Carlion (2182 et al.); for e in Barri (2160); for au in Galle (2053) and Arelus (1355). Vowels are transposed in Gillamarus (Gillomarus, 1547 et al.) and consonants in Gafan, 168. All -bury place names have -bire or -birie. In consonants we find b for p (Jupiter, 913A; cf. chambo forr

champ, Lapan for Laban (11000) in the Destruction; added final d in Symond³¹⁷⁷; d for th in Adilstan (2935), Audeberd (Aethelbert, 2847), Egbrid (2915); t for th in Judit (2930) s for th in Suonceastre, Cise (Scythie, 517); th for d in ~~Eathwalder~~ Cathwalader (2905), Cathwalens (2863); omission of r in Temorius (Tremorius, 1511), Ambesbirie (1598) Aumesbire (Ambresbire, 1505); r for l in Frاندres (2606); ch for k in Danemaröhe (2046, 2999), Cham (Caen, 3093), Pasche (2164) cf. Pask 1785), Orchenéie (2465); w for v in Ewerwie (1440 et al.), Ewerard (3132), Wortiger (823), Walentin (456), Caenowre (1957); metathesis of r in Irneside (2995 et al.) and perhaps Egbrid (2915).

Hengist's "Saxon" cry, "Nime ure sexes!" (1148, 1155) shows absence of th from the end of the Imperative the reduction of soure to ure, and the reduction of ea to e in sexes.

Orthographic phenomena in French words, which may or may not have their significance, are:

(a) vowel doubling in Baan (2183), rees (from rasus, 1663), sees (sapis, 1230; c.f. seiez, 1226), peel (palum, 1162), pees (pacem, passim), feel (felo, 1649), neez (natus passim), loos (781 et al.), iissir, iissuz, rix etc. (passim, but iissuz 2264)

(b) eal for elle in eal (passim), beal (124, 1800), puceal (994), demoiseal (2930).

(c) feille, feil for fille, passim (cf. empeizement, 1099)

(d) very common diphthongising of e in tiel (passim)
siez (sapis, 2266), fiel (fel, 274), pier (patrem, 270, 1091
 3116), chief (252, 424), chier (3032 et al.) eschiel, eschiele
 (2508, 2619) chief (cadit, 2660) derechief (2910) chiereté
 (2894) iesm (2264, 1225?) lied (latus, 40¹⁷⁷; laetus 183 et al.)
assied (assez, 1376) estier (ester, 2565, 2688), and many
 infinitives, preterites and past participles of conj. I.

(e) reduction of ie in pere (pierre 1190, 1529 et al.)
necce (nepas, 399 et al.) arer, arere (2551, 2859) maner
 (1270 et al.) assegied assegé (1375, 1768), terce (286),
tendrai, retendrai (2412, 920) vendras (1342 et al.), bere
 (2712) heriter (noun, 2978), dener (1915), quert (1484), amitez
 (141), meitez (1028).

(f) eie for ee: espeie (2200, 2211), valeie (2600),
seiez (sapis, 1226); cf. cunreies (passim) cunreeies (1738)

(g) foai for fei (1196)

(h) leil (cunseil, 386; cf. leal 462)

(i) what appears to be the tautological use of i, eg.
"eh la presse i fu occis" (2697); also many examples of ni
 (n'1?) where we expect ne eg. 241, 666, 1225, 1229, 1236, 1238,
 1711, 2025-6, 2361, 2544; si for se, sei (2300?)

(j) prevalence of svarabhaktic e before v.

(k) poice (pouls, 1671), provoitz (provosts, 301),
vois (vouloir, 1282), coilla (coula 222)

In the consonants we find:

(a) d for t: perde (95, 2756), gard (subj. 2661), but c.f. sourtes (sourds, 3064).

(b) f for v: naferer, etc. passim, nafez (navees, 860)

(c) d at the end of many past participles in e, u; also invariably ad (habet), ansied, cungied amisted.

(d) -se, -ce, -sse for s in eloquence (641), tense (640) romance (986), bretance (987, 1607), nece, decesse (2872) demorance (: anz, 2928), fonce (1320), founce (2850) Escoce (Escos, passim) curteisse (1959), peese (2871); ~~xxx~~ C.f. ~~xxxxxxx~~ pres (presse, 2218), engres (engresse, 2219); also orgoilouse (masc. 2777).

(3) omission of r in leve (1586), ~~xxxxxxx~~ nomez (nomer, 2453), suverse (2792), pristent (2884) desirez (desirers, 1860).

A number of these ~~xxx~~ peculiarities may be slips of the pen. Some are no doubt normal to most Anglo-Norman texts, representing general phonetic tendencies or common scribal habits, in many areas, though to call them such does not explain their origin. A good many, however, represent the scribe's attempts to render French sounds as heard or spoken by him as well as English ones admittedly more likely to show dialectal signs.

The doubling of a and e (rarely i and o, says Vising, Anglo-Norman Language and Literature, p.31.) is regarded as characteristic of Anglo-Norman as a whole. It does not appear as often in Pierre de Langtoft as in the

present text, however. If it denotes vowel lengthening, it represents a still existing tendency of the dialects of south-western England. A 19th-century student of dialect Dr. Baynes, in claiming that the Somerset dialect of his time closely represented the classical language of the West Saxon kingdom, pointed out that with the softening or gliding-over^{of} consonants and the lengthening of vowels, the dialect tended to become largely a language of vowel sounds. Though doubling of i and o are in Vising's opinion rare, oo occurs in two proper names and in loos in the present text; iissir, etc. though perhaps only a form of eissir and etymologically justifiable, may illustrate a characteristic trait of Robert of Gloucester, who spells wiif, liif, etc.

The spelling Baathe well represents the present-day west country pronunciation^{of the} place-name. Cicestre (Cirencester, 1934) and Berle (Berkeley, 3248) might almost be phonetic spellings of the present-day names of these places. Schaftisbury seems a Dorset spelling for a Dorset place-name, as soh is a characteristic combination in the Owl and the Nightingale from that county. Gloucester, more fortunate than most repeated place-names, occurs six times in the same form (Gloucestre). Suoncastre is evidently a southern form, as the northern pronunciation would be Suanpcastre or Sangcastre. The change of ae into a in Alvered, etc., is also southern; Huchon says that ae becomes a more often than e in Gloucestershire. So far, then, the

evidence suggests a southern English origin, with reasons in favour of the west.

This may be supported by the numerous examples of the diphthongising of e into ie. Tanqueray (Recueil de lettres anglo-normandes, p. xxx) says this is common after 1300: it is also common in Southern English, particularly south western, as shown by numerous forms like fiet (fet), dieth (deth), ifieldes (felt) in Robert of Gloucester. Modern Gloucestershire and Shropshire glossaries have dyeth (death), yed (head), yea (can), hyup (heap) and many other examples to show that the tendency is still prevalent. A letter written in 1322 for or by a lady of the Marcher Despensar family spells her name Alianore a la Despensiore (Tanqueray, Recueil p.113), which beside ie for e shows a for e, as in Barri, achater, aparcoud, manacier, sarmonant, imprat in our text, and parra for serra in a letter of Roger Mortimer, also a Marcher. Perhaps the spelling eal for elle has some connection with this tendency, or is simply an example of the ~~Swiss~~ Southern tendency to spell ea for e.

Robert of Gloucester commonly shows the group eis: e.g. Romesais, heiseman (men of high rank), isais (Middle English eise, from aisé). Espais etc. may therefore show connection with the west country: if the Anglo-Norman eis be accounted an importation from South-West France, c.f. Visling op. cit. p.32) it must not be forgotten that Bristol

and the Severn formed the chief avenue into England from that region. The prevalence of svarabhaktic e may also have some connection with a tendency shown in such Gloucestershire words as leatheron (leathern), ellum (elm), entony (entry). In Robert again we find hips, filled appearing as hepes, feled: the forms feille, feil may have some relation with this ~~xxxxx~~ tendency, or with the beginning of the rich i-diphthong which enthusiasts regard as one of the beauties of the modern Gloucestershire dialect, ("foai" may be connected with this). As feille, however, is the form given in Kelham's 18th-century Dictionary of "Norman," it seems probable that this spelling was general at least in law French, (cf. treiste in Plaintes de la Vierge). Our ms shows almost invariable preference for u-spellings in words like oum, pur, honur; in a letter of the Abbot and Convent of St. Peter, Gloucester, (Tanqueray, p.5.) pur, oum, drux dunks, respundu, lur, seignur, purprys, show the same preference.

Other phenomena noted are rather conflicting if they are to be taken as indications of locality. -Biry for -bury was general by this time, and only appears to exclude Kent and the North. The appearance of p in Lapan, f in nafez, and what seems a strong sibilance in Escoce, eloquence curteisse, etc. might point towards Wales. Pangor, however appears for Bangor in the ms of the Brut (B N. f.f. 1450) on which Le Roux de Lincy based his edition, (v. 14265) without allowing us to claim a Welsh origin for the ms. On the other

hand, we find voicing in such spellings as perde for parte, Jubiter. We find th becoming d in Adilstan, Egbrid, Cadwaleder alternates between that form and Cathwalader, while Cadwalan is called Cathwalena. The Anglo-Saxon thorn is kept in Apelwolf (2924, 2927), and the question of th is still further complicated by the appearance of Thongcoaster as Suoncoastre, and Soythia as Cise - for the latter, Layamon a Worcester man, has Soise. "Nime ure sexes" does not allow us to draw any conclusions as to dialect: the same passage of Layamon, contains alternative spellings in the two places in which the phrase occurs.

Such ^{con}inclusiveness, however, is not unfavourable to the idea of an origin not far from Gloucester. The dialect of the region prefers, and preferred, v to f and z to s, yet Robert of Gloucester has vif for five, and French victuailles appears in Gloucestershire as fittles. Lather for ladder, and dreaten for threaten show similar confusion to that in our ms. Zachrisson (Anglo-Norman Influence in English Place-Names, p. 43) says that the sound-change from d(th) to d is well evidenced for the South of England in late middle English times, but that "inverted spellings" of th for d are also sporadic through all the south and south-west. Though alternation of r and l, giving titre and title, autel and autier, was common in the middle ages Frاندres may be an example of the confusion which gave gallely, querm (qualm), syllinge, still occurring in

Gloucestershire and Shropshire in the 19th century. The omission of r noted was also a trait of dialectal words in those counties. Prior, in the passages already cited, thought that as r was pronounced more strongly in the North its omission might be a sign of southern origin. Ch for kr though perhaps only graphical, may illustrate the tendency found in such Gloucester words as shab for scab, shatter for scatter. By the eighteenth century, o had been diphthongised to uo in Gloucestershire, as shown by spellings like stwons (stones) gwoes, mwother in dialect writings. This tendency may be represented in Suongcastre.

In connection with the alternation of f and v and other sounds in Gloucestershire, and with the use of i noted in our ms, it is interesting to quote the evidence of one John Smyth, warden of the fisheries in the Hundred of Berkeley at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Writing in 1639 at the age of 73, he says:-

"In this Hundred of Berkeley are frequently used certaine words proverbs & phrases of speech which wee huddreders conceive...to bee not only native but confined to the soile, bounds & territory thereof.

"Soⁿ naturall is the dialect of pronouncing the re (y) betweene words endynge and beginnyng with consonants, that it seems droppinge from the aire into our mouths: as, John y Smith, sit y downe, I can y finde it, come y hither, well y said.... with thousands the like,

accomptinge our selves by such manner of speach to bee true patriots, And true preservers of the honored memory of our old forefathers, Gower, Chauser, Lidgate, Robert de Glouc and other of those ~~and~~ former ages.

"The letter (ff) is frequently used for V, as fewed for viewed, fowe for vowe, fenison for venison, farnish for varnish; and others the like.

"The Tre (V) is also frequently vused for (f) as vethers for fethers..... So powerfull a ~~xx~~ prerogative of transplantaõn have wee hundreders over the alphabet." (Quoted by J. Drummond Robertson, English Dialect Society Publications, No. 61, 1890).

The case of Lapan, Jubitor, chambe, nafez, perde, etc. may merely show orthographical difficulties occurring when English was adopting French words and English scribes were writing French. Amricot, wardrope (Middle English form of garde-robe) and fittles are probably signs of the fact that French consonants like b, d, v, had a more plosive character for English ears than those letters usually represented in English. Jubiter is still the English pronunciation of the word. Similarly s, pronounced z in Anglo-Saxon and nowadays in the west and generally when final, may have seemed inadequate to our scribe for representing final s in French, and led him to the interesting renderings for sloquens, Escos, etc. His spellings of tense Romance, with similar ones in deccase, use, pacc, are of

course still with us. An intervocalic f in Anglo-Saxon and Welsh was pronounced v, nafe may have no special significance. The change of v into w in the proper names and in sweasqued (2803). sweasques (177) does not seem to indicate any particular area, as the change is usually regarded as widespread in the 14th century. Waterhouse, however, (Early English Texts Society, extra series no. 104) gives it as a characteristic of mss executed in Dublin in the 15th century. Woice, wou, (vocu) appear in the Cursor Mandi, (Northern English, 1300-1325).

Such indications as might be thought to exist in the foregoing rather inclusive material may acquire greater value if confirmed by the matter of the Chronicle.

As the Catalogue says, the chronicler shows but scanty knowledge of the period. Undoubtedly a cleric, he was chiefly concerned with the succession, benefactions and burial of the monarchs, who are catalogued rather in the manner of the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah. Details recorded by him may therefore have some significance in ~~conjecturing~~ conjecturing his locality.

A number of important reigns are dismissed in few lines, yet Edmund Ironside gets twenty-two, though his rule lasted only a few months and was never recognised by the larger part of England. A number of his battles with Canute were fought in the west country, and their final agreement was made on the Severn island of Olney. Our

the only person known to reside local to Simon
scribe gives Glastonbury, 17 miles ~~away~~ from Gloucester,
as his burial place, and spells the name etymologically.

It is worth noting that the Arthurian legends,
of which our ms is one more perpetuation, centred round,
and were fostered by, the Abbey of Glastonbury. The
space taken by Arthur's legendary reign in this ms, (834
lines out of 2914 of the Brut) may have some relation to
this, though more probably due to similar disproportion
in Wace, where Arthur occupies 4335 out of 15,000 lines.
The Arthur legends were in any case looked upon in the west
as somewhat common property, but the absence here of any
addition to them should be an argument against a Welsh
origin, particularly in view of important omissions such
as Merlin's prophecy of Arthur's return and the Hope of the
Welsh:

Encor i est, Breton l'atandent (L 13685, A 13279)

Of the reign of Henry III we are told:

La bataille de Lewes fu en sun temps:

Mult i perdi de ses parenz, (v. 3173)

But Evesham is dealt with at some length:

Et de Evesham la bataille

Ou mainte mil fu ocis sanz faille,

Et Sir Symond de Muntford

Et ~~Sir Henry~~ meinte altre de sun efforz,

Et Sir Henry sun fiz

Et meint pruz chivaler gentiz,

Et Sir Hugh le despenser

Et meint vaillant bacheler. (v. 3175 et seq.)

Simon de Montford's final campaign was of course fought

along the Severn and the Welsh border, while Hugh le

Despenser, Chief Justiciar of the barons' government, was

the only Marcher baron to remain loyal to Simon,

This may indicate the author's local interest and possible sympathy with the Despensers. The impression is heightened by the mention of another Sir Hugh as Edward II's favorite when we should expect Gaveston to be mentioned first. The latter does not appear at all, however. The author's sympathy all through seems with the king and Despenser and the latter's death is a "vile huntage." It is not clear which of the Despensers is intended, but as the elder was hanged, drawn, and eaten at Bristol, and the younger at Hereford, the knowledge shown is quite compatible with west-country authorship. The strong terms used to condemn Roger Mortimer's actions make it unlikely that the author lived within the Mortimer domains, extending over large parts of south Shropshire and Herefordshire. Edward II's last refuge before his capture was in the Glamorganshire mountains near Neath Abbey.

The final recital of this king's burial and the miracles at his tomb seems the strongest argument for an origin not far from Gloucester. Fear of Mortimer made a number of west-country abbeys refuse to receive the king's body after the murder at Berkeley, but the Abbot of St. Peter's Gloucester gave it sumptuous burial. He had his reward. The legend of the miracles wrought at Edward's tomb brought such a ~~xxxxx~~ concourse of pilgrims and such revenue

that St. Peter's was soon relieved of its debt, the nave was restored and many additions made to the buildings. Further, the Abbey received remission of taxation and other privileges from Edward III after Mortimer's fall. We have noted the condemnatory language about the latter. No doubt other ~~xxxx~~ religious houses in the neighbourhood and on the roads to Gloucester shared to some extent in the prosperity of St. Peter's.

All this seems to point to an author having some acquaintance with west-country events in spite of general ignorance of history. His liking for ships in the miniatures may mean familiarity with some port like Bristol, Newport or Gloucester. His rendering of the Giant's Circle (f.30) suggests that he knew Stonehenge in Wiltshire.

What might seem a difficulty arises from the word gaine (3079) or gaigne (3142) in both cases preceded by the masculine article and meaning "arrow." If this is merely the French word from vaginam, the change of meaning seems rather violent, and the use of the masculine article in both places rather unusual persistence in carelessness or ignorance. We find in Irish and Gaelic a masculine word of unknown foreign origin spelt gaine or gainne, meaning "arrow, shaft, reed." Though a is the vowel in this word, and in the graphic representation of a sound like n-mouillée, a scribe with Anglo-

Norman spelling habits would no doubt write it as it appears here, in the spelling still accepted in Irish dictionaries. This might indicate an Irish scribe, for it seems unlikely that an Englishman taught after the school of Stratford-atte-Bowe would take such liberties with a French word, or borrow an Irish one.

The appearance of mures for some such word as juvres (895) - Wace has jenes in this passage - may be an echo of the Gaelic mor (big.) Our author makes the youths in question five years older than Wace's, who were only fifteen. He was generally careful to indicate i and j, and mures seems to be what he intended, using the adjective as substantive, as in French. Further, the spellings provoitz (provosts), poice (pouls, "poice ?"), coilla (coula, perhaps negligence in writing) and vois (2nd person singular of vouloir) may have something to do with Irish usage in words like poitin, noigin, cailin, which have given us potheen, nozzin, and colleen. The first i represents a glide between back vowel and front consonant. Suoncastre might then be explained, if the scribe were Irish, by Irish difficulty with English breathed th, while as d in Anglo-~~Irish~~ Irish often becomes a sound resembling voiced th. Cathwalens and Cathwalader may add their support. We have already noted Waterhouse's opinion about interchange of y and w in Anglo-Irish mss of the 15th century. In the same passage he includes confusion of th with d and t as characteristic.

The presence of an Irish monk in a Gloucestershire or South Wales monastery, or his showing phonetic traits of this region, could be easily accounted for. The bulk of the Anglo-Norman army which invaded Ireland came from South-Wales and the marches, and the English dialect imported into Ireland was that of south-western England. Conquering nobles, such as the de Lacies, made gifts of Irish property to abbeys in their land of origin, and a number of west-country monasteries still held these in the 14th century.

One such religious house was Lanthony-by-Gloucester or Lanthony Secunda, originally daughter cell of Lanthony in Monmouthshire. After ill-treatment of the monks by the wild Welsh, it became their chief house, to which they moved with their chattels and their books, leaving Prima as a cell. King John confirmed a number of grants and benefactions, as did Edward II. We may note that both these monarchs are well treated in this ms; in most chronicles John, particularly, gets few good words. In 1342, shortly after the date of our ms, which would be far from hindering his policy, of popularising French for war purposes, and in which the conquests of his spiritual ancestor, Arthur, are glorified at length, Edward III took Lanthony Secunda, with its Irish estates, under his special protection. Finally, the only known possessors of the ms were west-country families, and the Luttrells have been at Dunster since 1402.

All these are of course merely interesting possibilities. The scribe is certainly abysmally ignorant of English history in general, even as understood at the time. Non-English birth, and remoteness from books and authoritative information might account for this. The knowledge he does show is chiefly such as would be gained by a resident in the south-western Marches, a region in which Norman strongholds and French abbeys came early and Anglo-Norman tradition persisted late, and where we find French words like stank (estanc), agate (aux aguets), levence (levains, O.F. nominative?), suant (suivant), fittle, still part of the folk speech in the 19th century.

The historical evidence is certainly stronger than the linguistic. If the former be thought to have some ~~xxx~~ validity, it gives more value to the latter and greater justification for discussing it.

III MATTER OF THE "BRUT"

To treat at all adequately the question of the relationship of the Egerton version with the other Bruts, or to study the provenance of the changes which it shows and its apparent originalities, would alone provide sufficient material for a whole thesis. An attempt will be made, however, to point out the main lines of comparison and differentiation, and thus to arrive at some estimate of the author's contribution to the body of pseudo-history in which Geoffrey of Monmouth and Wace had led the way.

The Brut had by this time been popular for nearly two centuries. It had exerted a great influence on European literature, reinforcing and perhaps ~~surpassing~~ surpassing that of the Historia, first best-seller in the "matter of Britain." Margaret Pelan has traced this influence in works of Chrétien, Thomas, Marie de France and other writers of the period immediately following Wace. Her conclusion, "Son influence fut de courte durée et s'épuisa rapidement," may be true of Wace's direct influence on purely literary writers of the Continent. But, as we find in the present ms and its many predecessors and successors, the Brut is still looked upon, two centuries after its appearance, as the standard history of England; it is hardly to be improved upon, only to

be added to for the years subsequent to its finishing-point. Layamon translated and enlarged it for the "well-born", King John sent from Northampton in 1205 for the "*Romantium de Historia Angliae*" to "beguile his humours", and the industrious translator, Robert Mannyng of Brunne, again Englished it in 1338, about the date of our ms, adding a translation of Pierre de Langtoft's chronicle to bring it up to date. Pierre's own chronicle consisted of an abridgment, much more summary than the present one, of Wace's poem as far as it went, with the addition of his own account of subsequent history. In the fifteenth century Caxton prints it, in a prose version called the "*Cronycles of Englonde*", as a no doubt still-popular history.

The linguistic and metrical changes wrought by this time in Wace's poem will be discussed separately: only the most noteworthy questions in the matter of the piece will be touched upon in this chapter. Obviously, in reducing 9984 lines of Wace (about 10,300 in Le Roux de Lincy's edition) to 2914 of his own, the author had to exercise some judgment in deciding what to retain and what to omit, and also, if the result of his operation was to be readable, some skill in the joining of what remained; not content with this, however, he made various small additions which usually appear his own, since

they are not found in the variants furnished by the different texts of Wace, or in similar works. It is perhaps this personal contribution which is the most interesting, as affording material by which to assess the author, his ideas and ability behind the wonted anonymity of the Middle Ages.

The best way to begin seems to compare, from the literary point of view, the first lines of the Egerton ms with the version of Wace represented in Arnold's text and variants. This will afford sufficient indication of the author's method and the relation of his text with the groupings of the mss. Some account will then be given of the principal kinds of omissions, then of the most important additions, and a note on the value of the Chronicle portion will lead into a summing-up of the author and his work.

The same letters will be used to denote the different mss of the Brut as in Arnold's Introduction. They are as follows:

- A. College of Arms, Arundel XIV.
- B. British Museum, Royal 13 A XXI.
- C. " " Cotton Vitellius A.x.
- D. Durham Cathedral C.IV 27. 1.
- E. British Museum, Harley 6508.
- F. " " Additional, 32125
- G. Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 2447
- H. " Nationale, fond français 1450 (olim Cangé²⁷)
- J. " " " 1416 (olim Colbert
7515)
- K. " " " 794 (olim Cangé³³)
- L. Lincoln Cathedral 104.
- M. Montpellier, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole de Médecine, 251.

- N. Bibliothèque Nationale, f.f. 1454 (olim 7537)
- P. Ms belonging to Mr. Boies Penrose (America), formerly at Christ Church, Canterbury.*
- R. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 2981.
- S. Bibliothèque Nationale, nouvelles acquisitions fr. 1415 (olim Colombine Library, Seville, 1098).
- T. Corpus Christi, Cambridge, 50.
- V. National Bibliothek, Vienna, 2603.

In line 6, the majority of texts have "Ne ne lur volt tenir dreiture." Egerton attaches itself to a group PSFA by having faire for tenir, but is unlike any other by further insertion of "nule." In line 7, Engleter for the standard Bretagne attaches Eg. to the group SRGM. The insertion of tote in line 8 makes Eg. unlike any others except A and G, which omit en. Lour for le in v. 11 puts Eg. in the group DLSAR. "Arivast" for "mer passa" in v. 16 groups it with D and L only. "L'Emperere" for "Claudius" at v. 25 brings it into the group DLSGRM. V. 29, "Purpensa sei qe fereit" for "Purpensa sei en meint endreit," again groups Eg. with SRGM, except that these have "que il fereit," making the correct number of syllables. To continue in less detail:

- V. 32 is as in DLSGFARM.
- v. 37 is unlike all other versions.
- v. 39: conjunction "qe" appears in no other version.
- v. 43: "la" is in no other version except D, which omits "ki."
- v. 50: "destrer" is in no other version.

* Now British Museum Addit. Ms. 45103.

- v. 53. Most texts have "enseigne reial", DLFORM have "enseigne le rei", Eg. has "le signe le Roi"
- v. 55. "nel" for "ne" as in SKFM
- v. 56. "Quident" is inserted, not appearing in the others.
- v. 64. unlike all other versions.
- v. 68: all others have "sui", not "pursuie".
- v. 80. is unlike all others.
- v. 94 "trové" for "tomé" in all others
- v. 106: "qe li" for "qu'il li" as LCT.
- v. 107. "soul" in no other.
- v. 112 "s'entre acordierent" for "s(acointerent", as SF, (s'acorderent)
- vv. 113-4. in no others - an insertion.
- v. 115 as CGRM
- v. 118 "devereit" - "deveit" in all others
- v. 123 "Sin" - "Si" in all others.
- v. 139: ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ "puis" as SHG; others "tut!"
- v. 140 : "sun" as JGR - others "lor"
- vv. 161-2. all others have : A Eleutere enveia, / Ki ert pape, si li manda. V. 162 is thus an insertion
- v. 163: all others have subjunctive "enveiaist" for "envoier"
- v. 170. "la ley dieu" for "la lei" in the others.
- v. 184 as DLSRM
- v. 185 quite different from all others.
- v. 192 "salvacion" as SJKGM
- v. 198: "Lucius" for "li reis" as SLRGMDA

After v. 208 some 300 lines of Wace are omitted -

vv. 209-10 resume the last passage in Wace that has been omitted but vv. 211-12:

Issi tindrent Bretaigne a force.
Les Romeins od leur afforce.

are not ~~being~~ in any text of Wace, who, in fact, had just been telling of successful rebellion on the part of the Britons.

Vv. 218-9:

Tant creut la guerre et tant muntast
Coel en bataille, si le venquie

furnish an example of the author's method of abridgment. Wace

says:

Tant creut la guerre etant munta
 Qu'il unsemble se combatirent
 Grant damage s'entrefirent.
 Choei fu plus forz si venqui (Arnold's edition
 5598-5601)

Vv. 221-2 have been inserted and the order of

the words ~~xxx~~ in vv. 225-6 has been altered, giving a new rhyme
 out: ~~solt~~ instead of ~~nurrie~~: ~~clergie~~. From this point on-
 wards the same continues: various points of detail occur
 which are found in none of the other texts, others show general
 similarity with ms groupings which normally include DLCSFGR, while
 occasionally a number of lines are more or less skilfully
 compressed into fewer, or insertions are made like: Ambedeus
 se firent coroner / A Londres devant l'autier (vv 255-6), which
 do not appear in any ms of Wace. It thus seems clear that,
 while the Egerton ms is based upon a version represented by a
 msgroup which includes particularly those of Durham, Lincoln
 and Seville and the Cotton ms, the scribe reserved to himself
 a considerable independence in form and matter.

Many examples like the one given above show that
 the abridgment was not a unskilfully accomplished, and was
 not achieved simply by leaving out more or less lengthy
 passages. Such omissions were made, however, and it seems
 possible to classify them broadly, if not to discover the rea-
 sons guiding the scribe. Generally the matter omitted was of

a tedious or complicated nature, and it is remarkable how little the story as a whole suffers: only occasionally are we left without the conclusion of an episode, or made to wonder when some character appeared or disappeared.

In general, battles and campaigns are greatly condensed, or omitted altogether. Perhaps public taste was no ~~xxxx~~ longer for rambling battle stories, with single combats detailed stroke by stroke. Thus forty lines on Marius' invasion of Scotland are left out, then three hundred on Severus' campaigns in Scotland and the North, with Fulgenes' rebellion and subsequent complications. Four battles between Vortimer and Hengist's Saxons ~~it~~ disappear, those of Conaburgh and Verolam are shortened and Uther's unsuccessful siege of Tintagel and much of the struggle between Looth and Octa left out. In Arthur's reign, a gap of about six hundred lines (at v. 1952 of Egerton, after v. 9289 of L's edition, v. 9054 of A's) leaves out his defeat of the Saxons Balduf and Colgrim with the famous battles of Halidon Hill and Mount Badon, his conquest of Scotland and Ireland, and the resulting rejoicings and rewards for his warriors. The campaigns against Norwegians and Danes and against Frolo are greatly curtailed, as are Arthur's single combats with the latter and the giant of Mount Saint/Michel, nameless here though called Dinabuc in Wace, a name suspiciously like that of Merlin's boyhood enemy. Riton,

the second giant is omitted altogether. Another long omission of over six hundred lines (after v. 2593, L.12019, A 116160) brings us almost immediately from the giants to the fight with the emperor of Rome - Gawain's adventures and the preliminary challenges and skirmishings are entirely lost, and Arthur's nephew becomes an insignificant personage. The decisive engagement between Arthur and Lucius occupies only sixty-six lines in Egerton (vv.2640- 2705) compared with 440 in Wace (L 12936 sqq., A 12535 sqq.); The prowess of Kei and Beduer then Arthur's slaughterous intervention which turns the scale when all seemed lost, are curtailed, the vengeance of Hirengas, Beduer's nephew and the fight between Gawain and the Emperor are omitted. About 200 lines of Arthur's final struggle with Modred disappear: the supreme battle of "Tamre" has only eight lines and lose Wace's comment: "ne sai dire ... ne qui venqui ne qui morut."

After Arthur, Wace's text receives less respect than ever. The revolt of Modred's sons against Arthur's successor, Conan, the struggle of Vortiporus against the Saxons, the whole reign of Malgo, disappear. About 250 lines of the story of Gormond (here Gurguint) and Isembard are omitted: Gormond's coming from Africa, as Merlin foretold, his conquest of Ireland and Northumbria and the capture of Cirencester. Some 600 lines on the Heptarchy disappear

with the omission of Cadwan or Cadwalan and his dispute with Elfroi or Elfrith, the long-drawn out wars between their sons, then between Cadwalan, Peanda and Oswald.

Besides battle pieces, the long-winded eloquence of Wace's characters very properly suffers condensation. The author generally shows some skill in choosing just those few lines of a speech which give the gist sufficiently for the purpose of the story, without frills and rhetoric. This is usually an improvement in realism, as when Arthur's cry to his men in the thick of the fight is reduced from eleven lines to three (vv. 2683-50). "Un sage Romme" who gives a valedictory address to the Britons on the departure of the Roman forces fills twenty lines instead of sixty. Bishop Eldadus, perhaps as a result of dissension between ~~the~~ the author's monastery and episcopal authority, receives summary treatment: his first forty-line speech on the treatment to be given Hengist, on the biblical parallel of Agag is omitted altogether; his second, a plea for Hengist's sons is reduced by half, the Biblical parallel again being lost. Merlin's speeches are greatly reduced, as are many eve-of-battle harangues, and particularly the great feast of political oratory and repetition which begins with Lucius' ultimatum to Arthur (v. 253, L. 10919, A. 19639). The long story of the old woman whom Beduey

met is omitted, so that we are left in ignorance of Elaine's ultimate fate. Again a change in public taste may be indicated: Chrétien de Troyes, in his imitations of Wace, already seems to have gently satirised knightly speechifying as well as lengthy battle descriptions.

Less accountable is the omission or curtailment of descriptions of feasting or ceremonial, an important factor in Wace's popularity. Some fifty lines of Wace (L 8582, A 8376) describing Uther's ceremonial entry and coronation at Winchester are condensed into:

Uther se fist coroner
A Wincestre cum fort justiser. (1754)

The famous descriptions of Caerleon, which "sambla Rome", and of Tintagel, are left out, while the extravagant splendour of Arthur's victory festivities is much reduced. The celebrated - and fictitious - list of notables, the scene of their arrival, the Queen's reception of the ladies, the thanksgiving service which went on all day, with the knights' coming and going

Tant por oir les clers chanter
Tant por les dames ngarder,

lose in total some two hundred lines, and fifty lines of the actual feast go the same way. Much of this was in any case Wace's invention, as Geoffrey has only a few lines on it. Another famous passage, the departure of the fleet from Southampton, is shorn of the greater part of its glory of highly

technical description.

Very many of Wace's moralisings, explanations, name-etymologies, prophetic ~~xxx~~ allusions ~~xxx~~ and other literary baggage are dispensed with, no doubt in the interests of space rather than from any lowering in estimation of their value. The author cuts out Wace's indignation that Vortiger was marrying in Rowena, a pagan (L7163, A6993), omits the miraculous history of the Giants' Circle, the allusion to the old Trojan custom of segregating the ladies at the feast, the denunciation of Modred's treachery before he performed it (L11456-69, A 11178-88) Wace's explanations of the origins of the names of Hampton, Gloucester, Colchester, "Thongocaster," England and the English, the Saxon counties, are omitted or curtailed, as are his notes on the location or history of Verulamium, Meneve, Gonore. Wace had already abandoned Geoffrey's lengthy book of Merlin's prophecies, but the Egerton author restricts the magician's utterances even more than Wace; after the erection of Stonehenge we are allowed to forget him, whereas Wace details his prophecies about Arthur, the coming of Gormond, and the end of the British kings. It is noteworthy, however, that most of Wace's proverbial verses are kept, e.g.

Tiels porte qe puis socure (W; recoevre)	408
Merci ait qe merci querit	1484
Engine surmunte vertu	1536
N'i ad del mort nul recovrer	1727

The whole part of the story which follows the end

of Arthur suffers drastic omissions. Perhaps this was the climax towards which the author had been working, after which he lost interest, or perhaps he had to work within limits of space and had given too generous treatment to the original up to that point. St. Augustine, for example, loses two long passages of about 100 lines, his miracles, his mission to Dorset, the dispute with the Welsh Church and the Bangor massacre. The story of the wicked Dorset folks' tails, apparently Wace's invention, may have seemed a little far-fetched, and the Saint's treatment of rival clergy unedifying. Finally, beside the omission of the involved janglings of the Heptarchy already noted, the whole reign of Cathwalader is condensed from 200 lines to twenty-three, leaving no mention of the sending of Ivor^{and} Ini to perpetuate the British nation in Wales, or the King's death on pilgrimage at Rome - our author makes him die in Brittany on his flight from the mortality.

Such are the principal omissions from the standard version of Wace, the negative side of the work of abridgment and adaption. There is also a more positive side, on one hand, the concentration into a few lines, sometimes with considerable differences, of matter occupying a good deal more space in the original; on the other, actual additions which do not appear in any other text. Characteristic examples of the first class beside the few already given are:

Wace: (L 7243)
(A 7067)

As Bretuns ad mult ennuied
Si unt al rei dit et preied
Que cele estrange gent ne creie,
Kar a veue se desleie;
Trop ad de cels paiens atrait,
Vilanie est, grant hunte fait.
Departe les, cument que seit,
Ou tut u le plus en enveit.

Eg. 1076:

As Bretuns ad mult anuez,
Et si ont al Rei dit et priez
Ke cele estrange gent ne creie
Et de sa terre les envieie.

At v. 1425 sqq.
Eg. has

Eldolf l'ad venu aprismer
An guise de hardi chivaler.
Mult l'en haïout, et bien deit,
Par le mordre q'il feseit
En le pleine de Salesbire
Qant les Bretuns fist ocire.
Hengist atteint, si l'en onbraceast,
Par vive force l'en menast.

The l' of v. 1425 refers to Hengist. Wace has (L8007, A7807):

Gorlois, li cuens de Cornaile,
Vint cume pruz en la bataille;
Eldulf l'ad veu aprismer,
Plus seurs se fist e plus fier;
A guise de hardi vassal
Corut Henguist prendre al nasal,
A sei le traist, si l'enbruncha,
Par vive force l'enmena.

Then follow ten lines of direct speech from Eldolf expressing his hatred for "cest chien enragié" but not directly alluding to the Amesbury massacre. The Egerton author has thus made Eldolf draw near to Hengist, whereas Wace makes him gain fresh courage for his fight with the Saxon, at the approach of Gorlois; he then inserts four lines of his own giving

Eldolf's motive in indirect speech, for the ten-line passage of direct speech which comes later in Wace. This is a typical sample of his method. Similar ones are found in the list of notables arriving at Caerleon for Arthur's coronation (Eg, 2183, L 10462, A 10206 gives "Mandast tuz ses barons par baan," joining neatly with L 10499, A 10243: "Mandast ses Reis et ses Contes," - the list that follows is by no means the same as that of Wace, and ends with the rhymes vegnent; attargement, venir: chivalchier); and In the division of Arthur's army into "eschieles" (2802 sqq) - the arrangement of the commanders is quite different from that of Wace and the eighth "eschiele," is missed out altogether, (vv. 2614-5).

A few of the more significant alterations and additions in detail are worth noticing before passing on. Quite a number of complete couplets are inserted which do not appear in any version of Wace's text, e.g. the information that Constantius and Helena were crowned "A Londres devant l'autier," an obvious anachronism (vv. 255-6), the note that Octavius would regret making Conan his heir (vv 379-80), the explanation of the name "Bretaigne minor" ~~xxx 282-2~~ (vv. 441-2), the fact that there was none to oppose Maximilian's conquest of the Empire (vv. 459-60), that the Roman legion killed more than 15,000 Norsemen and Danes (vv. 573-4), that Vortiger came to Parliament (vv 738-9), that he was a traitor and approached Constant (vv 762-3), that Hengist and Horsa promised to serve him at his will (vv 922-3) etc. etc. It seems quite clear that a number of these insertions were made

with a view to illustration, as they occur immediately before a picture, e.g. vv 113-4:

Claudius out li Roi enbracé,
Par grant amour l'ad beïsse,

below which is depicted the embrace of two repulsive-looking royalties (f. 3a of the ms); vv 221-2:

Od le branc tiel coupe li dona
Ke jusc'al dentz le branc coïlla,

followed by a picture of Coel killing Astlepiadoc (f. 5a); vv. 610-11

Grant fu la doel qe la fust
Kant detenir ne les poust,

which form the motif of a picture of Britons registering deep emotion at the departure of the Romans (f. 12a); vv. 1469-70.

Devant le Roi s'est agenulez,
En halt s'ad ses meïnes levez

followed six lines later (f. 28a) by a picture of Gota on his knees, (the detail not given in the texts of Wace, though

Layamon has "He fell to the ground before the King's feet"); vv. 1831-2:

Semblance de Gorlois aveit,
A Tintagelle vindrent demaintenant

with a picture of Uther, Ulfin and Merlin approaching the castle;

vv. 2192-3:

Meint bel cumpaignie i veïsses venir,
Et espesement chivalchier,

introducing a picture of the "bel cumpaignie;" vv. 2796-9:

En Engleterre vint siglant,
Saxsons et païens menant.
En sa flot trois cent nefs aveit,
En Bretaigne oil ariveit

giving,, as already noted, a picture of Gurguint at sea;

vv. 2849-50;

Cil ad Seint Austin baptisez
Et en le Seint founce regenerez,

after which we see Aethelbert's crowned head and bare shoulders protruding from the font in which St. Augustine has plunged him, a notable difference from Wace's

Cil ad Saint Augustin oi,
Baptisiez fu, en Deu croi. (L 14143, A 13695)

Similarly vv. 8759-60 of Wace (Edition L, A 8533):

A Londres furent enveié,
Et en cartre pris et loié,

are quite gratuitously altered into:

A Londres les amenerent,
En la Tour furent posez,
Et od cheines mult ferme liez, (vv 1778-1780)

which furnishes an opportunity for a drawing of the prisoners entering the Tower of London. The foregoing may be considered to strengthen the suggestion in the first chapter that the author, scribe and illustrator were the same person, with a flair for the dramatic and the picturable.

A few other interesting touches do not appear in Wace; they sometimes bear a resemblance to Layamon's account, sometimes appear quite original. In no other version do we learn, for example, that those who informed Walins and Melga of Britain's undefended state were "les mariners qui les (i.e. the 11,000 virgins) guient" (v. 519), or that Vortiger was a pagan (v.

736 - "Païen fu" for Wace's "Uns fors hom") over-zealousness on the author's part since it is inconsistent with the King's concern at the paganism of Hengist and Horsa (v. 914 sqq.) The alteration of "le language as Saxons" (L 7122, A 6960) into "les langages" (1021), which appears in none of the variants, implies that the author was acquainted with the diversity of Anglo-Saxon dialects. The allusion to Parliament (v. 738) may have been merely a sign of the author's times, or due to the influence of Layamon, who mentions "hustings" in this passage. This influence may also be present in the account of the arrival of Hengist and Horsa (vv. 864 s q.)

"Alez tost, si les amenez."
Li baron sunt al terre hastoz,
Devant le Roi sunt venu,
Gentement li ont salu.

This is quite different from Wace (of L 6877 sqq. A 6721/sqq) but Layamon has "These came before the King and greeted him fair"; as Egerton, he gives the command in direct speech, which he prefers, instead of Wace's indirect speech. As a sidelight on the vexed question of the locality of Thongcaster comes the alteration of Hengist's "A un des maners que jo ai" (L 7060, A 6902) i.e. in Lincolnshire where he already had territory, into "A un des maners que joo sai" which betokens a much wider cupidity (v. 909). An interesting ^{change} is that in the line "Incubi demaines ont nom" (L 7633, A 7445) for which Egerton has: "Incubi et

Sucubi oie noun" (1273): though peculiar to our author, it implies at all events weak Latin declension on his part, since Incubi were tempters of nuns, while Succubae were temptresses of monks. No copyist of Wace seems to correct that poet's slip in placing the conception of Arthur both before and after the death of Gorlois, in which he only follows Geoffrey (L 8963, 9649a; A 8733, 8815). The author of the present ~~of the present~~ ms corrects this blunder, as does Layamon, but more neatly: he alters the second mention "La nuit a (ot) un fil ounceu," into "La nuit einz out un fiz ounceu." Other unique features are the mention of fourteen kingdoms as the extent of Arthur's domains (v. 2321), and the entirely fictitious return of St. Augustine to Rome to report to the Pope on the success of his mission (vv. 2859-62) in place of the unedifying account of the Bangor massacre. He makes Edwin, in Wace Cadwalen's bitter rival whom he finally kills, into the son and successor of "Cathwalens", apparently identical with Cadwalen (2870). Oswald, another English king killed by Cadwalen, through his ally Peanda, according to Wace, is here made Edwin's son and successor (2873), as in Layamon. Peanda is a "diffaié" (2878) which is true, but not in Wace. An original account is given of the death of Oswy (2888) and of Cathwalader (2913). Apparently medieval writers assumed the privilege of making what order they could from the chaos of the early Anglo-Saxon period.

Beside the seeming correction in the story of

Arthur noted above, there are others which are only apparent ones because of the bad text chosen by Le Roux: de Lincy, e.g. "Lundreis" for "ceus de Rome" at v. 831 and "le gent le Roi" for "li gent al duc" at v. 1843: Egerton shares the correct version with all the other mss. There are multitudinous examples of alterations in detail not shared with others, e.g. the interesting change from "Bien set, ce dist, de mal l'orine" (L 8472, A 8264) to "Tantost li mette en decline" (1672) or that of "A Barbfloe, en Costentin" (L 11363, A 11282) to "A Barbeflot en port lentin" (2531).

The author does not escape errors of his own, however; at v. 1088 he puts "sa mere" for "sa moillier" and thus makes Rowena into Vortimer's mother, forgetting that he has explained their relationship at vv. 1054-5; at v. 1341 he writes "fiz" for "fu" and makes Merlin a poor prophet, since by the change he is foretelling Vortiger's end at the hands of Constantino's grandson instead of his sons; at v. 1888, the omission of the complement to "liverast" which follows in Wace makes the passage meaningless unless the author saw in "liverast sur tous" the English "delivered-over-everything". There^{are} also curious changes in proper names, such as that of Gormon to Gurguint (the name of a giant of times earlier than Cassibelanus in Geoffrey of Monmouth), Tanet to Tamis as Augustine's place of arrival (2843) and Alain to Anlaf (2909). On the whole, however, the author shows care in his work of adaption, and intelligent skill in choosing and joining what he required from his original.

Gorlois i vint de Cornewaille,
Et sa femme i amena sanz faille (1793-4)

Geoffrey has : "aderat inter ceteros Gorlois dux Cornubiae cum Ygerna conjuge sua"; Layamon has no such compact mention of their arrival. For the passage 1829-39, in which Gorlois is named twice and which summarises: the disguising of Uther and the entry into Tintagel, Geoffrey has "commisit se medicaminibus Merlini et in speciem Gorlois transmutatus est" - there is nothing substantial, apart from use of the name, to connect Egerton with Geoffrey or any particular version. Vv. 1815-16, differing from Wace:

Li Reis apren li s'est hasté,
Ses terres en ad ars et gasté,

correspond roughly with Geoffrey: "collegit exercitum magnum petivitque provincias Cornubiae atque ignem in urbes accumulavit" The accounts of the end of Gorlois are quite different from each other. The Egerton ms. says, with Layamon, that the king's men assailed the castle in which Gorlois was (v. 1845), while Geoffrey says he was killed in a sortie after the King's followers had provoked him to battle.

This 14th century version of the Brut thus differs in its treatment of this and other episodes from that embodied in the vulgate texts, without giving any definite proof of exclusive recourse either to Geoffrey or to Layamon. The other resemblances elsewhere, however, might mean that the author knew

the latter, or his hypothetical source: that the likenesses between the Egerton ms and Layamon are so distant suggests that it was this French source rather than the English ~~xxxxxx~~ work. If so, this ms provides an argument in favour of Imelmann's thesis, though his data generally are not very securely founded. As the Munich Brut, which he considers part of the lost "expanded" version, stops short before the Egerton fragment begins, no comparison is possible. It is to be observed, however, that Layamon, who according to theory used this version, has a different and superior account of Lear and Cordelia from that of the Munich ms.

If it is difficult to trace a source for the alterations found in the Egerton ms, leaving us to assume that many of them, at all events, were the work of the scribe, there is at least one subsequent work, a well-known one, which seems derived from it or a very similar work. This is Caxton's "Cronycles of Englonde," published in 1480, with numerous subsequent editions which prove its popularity: as Caxton chose it for one of his first books, it was no doubt already highly popular. According to the British Museum Catalogue, the work is by Douglas, a monk of Glastonbury, with a continuation sometimes ascribed to Caxton. This Douglas cannot be found anywhere but in the Catalogue. His English prose account of British "history" resembles closely, as far as the end of the Brut, that contained in the Egerton ms, of which the traditional title, judging from the inscription of f.1 and that on the modern binding,

(Chronique d'Angleterre) seems to connect it with the same series at least as Caxton's publication. The frequent occurrence in the ^{latter} of French words like enchesun, which could not have been very current in English by the end of the fifteenth century, may betray a French original. In the actual matter of Douglas' or Caxton's chronicle we find similar methods of abridgment to those already in Egerton. The long passage about Severus and Fulgenes is omitted, and the narrative jumps from Lucius to Astlepiades and Coel (here called Astlepades and Coeyll). The story of the end of Gorlois corresponds to that of Egerton. There is no double account of the conception of Arthur, and that King only fights one giant. Gawain's exploits and the killing of Marcellus are omitted, as in Egerton, while the battle with Lucius is much curtailed. Aethelred is buried at St. Paul's. On the other hand Caxton's version gives a short account of Augustine's Welsh dispute, which is omitted from Egerton. The post-Brut account of British history ^{is different} from, and much fuller than that of Egerton, which is only fitting, since the century and a half which have elapsed should have seen some improvement on the historical knowledge which it shows.

It thus appears that the Egerton Brut was, if not the original, - and we have seen that it contains much that is not to be found in earlier versions, - at least an early example, of a shortened version of Wace's poem which enjoyed considerable favour even in Renaissance times.

IV THE CHRONICLE AND ITS AUTHOR

The author of this ms makes no corrections in the part of Wace's story which deals with historical times, for which recourse might have been had to the Saxon Chronicle, or other material available in English monasteries in the fourteenth century. He does in fact make more numerous and more material alterations in the story of historical times than in the legendary part, (no such distinction, of course, existed for the medieval writer). But, so far from bringing Wace's story nearer to history, they seem to take it further into fiction. His own continuation, apart from the very sketchy main outline, has hardly any greater claims to be called history. We shall therefore expect of the Chronicle little new or trustworthy material, but it contains much that is curious.

The complications of the so-called Saxon Heptarchy (or better, Anarchy) caused Wace some confusion. The Egerton author's solution, as we have seen, was to make matters simpler by applying the principle of primogeniture with which he was acquainted. He continues the method in the Chronicle. Egbert, his first monarch to follow the end of Wace's account, so far from being, as he says, Cadwalader's son, did not become king of Wessex till 802 well over a century after both Cadwalader and Caedwalla. He was indeed a contemporary of Charlemagne, but the author does not mention Egbert's stay at the ^{latter's} court as an exile from England. As he reigned thirty-seven years, the total span of thirty-two allotted here (xxx et ii anz vesqui", -2921) is rather inadequate.

Few indeed of the lengths of reigns given are correct.

Aethelwolf was Egbert's son, and did pay a visit to Rome, in 855, but in those turbulent times it would hardly have been safe for the King of Wessex to stay out of the country seven years, as stated here. It was of course Alfred, his youngest son, who made a long stay at Rome for his education. The Princess whom Aethelwolf married on his way back was the daughter of Charles the Bald, not of Charlemagne. The author may have been misled by some expression like "Charles douter ye gret Kyng", which we find in the "Shorter English Chronicle", c.1300. Peter's Pence, or Rome Penny, is mentioned in his reign. Wace says the pious tax was instituted by Ina, others think it was started by Offa, Egbert's contemporary in Mercia, while Lingard thinks Alfred its originator. As this passage seems to confuse Alfred with his father, it may support Lingard's opinion.

Aethelstan, who "apres li regna" (i.e. after Aethelwolf), was Alfred's grandson, so that three reigns are omitted, including Alfred's. That such an important and onlightened reign should be passed over, or combined with Aethelwolf's, confirms the impression that the author was either colassally ignorant or strongly biassed. This point will be returned to later.

The British Museum Catalogue points out some of the author's shortcomings as a historian. It accuses him of an anachronism in the reign of Aethelstan, identifying his "oslit Seint Johan, Arcevesque de Everwic", to whom the King owed his discomfiture of the "Scoteis" or "Escoco", with St John of Beverky, archbishop of York 705-718. Aethelstan's rule dated of course from 925 to 940, though our ms gives him only 9½ years. His adversaries were the

67

Northumbrians and Scots under Constantine , and the forces of the Danish Kings of Ireland, Anlaf Sihtricsson and Anlaf Gotfredson, driven from Northumbria by Aethelstan shortly before. (It is to be noted in passing that the name of Anlaf slips in twenty-five lines before for that of Alain, Cathwalader's host in Brittany 250 years earlier. There was in Aethelstan's time an Alain of Brittany, ward of the English King - the confusion may be due to the scribe's vague memory of some other work dealing with Aethelstan). Aethelstan's victory, referred to in vv. 2939-44, must be that of Brunanburh, until recently considered to be in Northumbria, not far from Beverley. The tradition on which this was based evidently finds an echo here. Without quoting Ingulphus of Croyland, commonly called a forger, though his account provided the basis for that of Lingard, the Catholic historian, we may give John of Bromton's version;

"Dum rex Adelstanus, pro aliquali dissensione inter ipsum et Constantinum regem Scotorum habita, versus Scotiam tenderet, beatum Johannem apud Beverlacum visitavit; super altare cultellum pro vadio posuit, promittens si victor rediret, cultellum digno pretio redimeret. Quod implevit; nam dimicando contre Scotos Deum rogavit ut prece Sancti Johannis Beverlaci aliquod signum evidens ostenderet quo praesentes et futuri cognoscere possent Scotos de jure debere Anglis subjugari; unde rex cum gladio suo scopulum percussit quendam lapideum juxta castrum de Dunbar quod usque hodie ad mensuram ulnae lapidas exictu cavatur; unde rex Adelstanus habita victoria et rege Constantino iterum submisso, filium ejusdem Constantini de sacro fonte suscepit; et in redeundo territorium Sancti Johannis possessionibus privilegiis et liber-

libertatibus varijs ditavit." (Chronicle, col. 838).

Our scribe was thus evidently not thinking of a lifetime intervention of the saint, only of a supernatural one; he alludes to him personally just as John says "rex... beatum Johannem.... visitavit", consistently with medieval faith and practice. Actually Beverley Minster was not dedicated to the English archbishop who became Lord of the town, but to the evangelist; the former had much to do with refounding and rebuilding it, however, and his fame no doubt soon outshone, or perhaps was confounded with, that of the other. His reputation was such that his image was one of the three carried by the English forces at the Battle of the Standard, 1138, the others being St Peter and St Wilfred of Ripon. The homonymous saints may have been confused by Aethelstan himself. The Yorkshireman *Pierre de Langtoft* places Brunanburh on the Humber, and says Aethelstan confirmed grants made to St John of Beverley. The whole matter seems best resumed by the anonymous local author of a "Short History of Beverley Minster" (1825): "The name of Athelstan is mentioned so often in conjunction with St John, that by many persons they seem to be considered as contemporaries and as united in founding the monastery at Beverley.... Athelstan had no share either in the founding or increasing the monastery, though it had great obligations to him as a powerful patron and liberal benefactor."

Three more reigns are skipped when Edgar, Aethelstan's son, is made his brother and successor instead of Edmund. The legend of St Dunstan's prophecy at his birth was a current one; we find it also in the *Cot. Vit. ms* of the *Brut*. It is natural that his comparatively peaceful and beneficent reign should be dilated

upon lyrically by a monkish author, since Archbishop Dunstan, champion of the monks and purger of the seculars, was the power behind the throne and as J.R.Green says, "to his time English monasticism looked back in later days as the beginning of its continuous life". It is noteworthy that the correct number of years (16) is assigned to his reign, but the author buries ~~the king~~ at London instead of Glastonbury. The next King, Edward the Martyr, he correctly inters at Shaftesbury. "Estrice" is of course Ethelfrida or Aelfrida.

The author is not quite so ignorant as indicated by the British Museum Catalogue when it criticises him for "making Alfred an illegitimate son of Edgar". "Alvered" is of course a common form of "Alfred", and it is possible our author confused him with Aethelred the Unready, or even tried to discredit the great Saxon King by saddling him with the other's reign. His confusion was probably worse confounded through Alfred's brother and predecessor also having the name Aethelred. If the name is Alfred's however, the deeds, the traitorous counsellor and the length of reign (37 years) are Aethelred's -

"En grant hunte sa terre garda
Car Daneis sovent ly gueroient
Par le conseil Edvîz vindrent."

Nothing is said of the treacherous massacre of Danes on St Brice's Day, or the King's flight into Normandy. The taint here attached to his birth (2982) is not found in the historians, who merely make him the son of Edgar's second wife. He dies, like the rest, "de ses amis mult regretez." Though the Catalogue has now been amended, it is still unjust to our author: he does not make Alfred or even Aethelred, "the illegitimate son of Edward Martyr;" but

70

plainly enough "sun frere", while if we understand "Aethelred" for "Alfred", his relationship with Edmund Ironside is correctly given.

It is difficult to see why, in such a summary account of English history, the brief reign of Edmund Ironside, who was in fact only acknowledged by London, should have twenty-two lines unless local legend finds an echo here. Edmund's connection with the West Country has already been mentioned. The author subscribes to the tradition that Eadric Streana was responsible for Edmund's death, as for most calamities of the time. The locally-produced Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester shows similar disproportion, giving Edmund 224 lines and making Eadric responsible for his death.

Canute's reign is given as eight years, no doubt through the author's reading, or at least writing, viii for vin. The only thing in the reign thought noteworthy by our author is a kind of Durbar given at London. Harold, Canute's successor, has the cognomen denoting irregular birth, instead of the more usual one of Harefoot. The author is rather generous with this title, having already applied it to Edgar's stepson Aethelred, while the Conqueror gets it later, of course legitimately. "Alfred Axifot sun frere" is evidently intended to be Harthacanute, though the name seems to show confusion with both Aethelred and Harefoot. The impression is strengthened by this King's being credited with the parentage of Edward the Confessor; the relationship of Edward and Harthacanute, both sons of Emma of Normandy, the former by Aethelred and the latter by Canute, seems to have been too much for our author.

The statement that Edward devised his kingdom to William

in 1066, with the insistence on Harold's punishment for wrongly seizing the throne, and the sardonic

A Harald vint dure novele,
Kar ferru fu parmi le corvele,

seem to be signs of a firm supporter of the Norman regime. There are other indications of this elsewhere. William's important reign gets only twelve lines. His pious foundation (Battle Abbey is no doubt intended, though not named) and the homage of his barons are the only points of interest to our author, who is an apologist for William Rufus; he says nothing of his unpopularity, and would have us believe this King died on a bed of sickness at Winchester.

The tales of years for the later monarchs are correct within a year or two, except in Henry II's case, (his reign is shortened seven years, no doubt because "Les franchise vouldreit retraire/Ke Seint Eglise devereit aveir") and Edward I's, who has eight years added to his. Henry III is given a reign of "ix anz cinckant et sis," which if it means 59½ years shows an excess of 3½.

Henry I's fame as lawgiver is duly recorded, but he died at Angers, not London. Maud is not mentioned, and two of Stephen's eight lines are devoted to his works of piety, which of course had the object of securing the support of the Church against followers of the Empress. Henry II was the son of Maud and Geoffrey of Anjou, not of Stephen as given here, and he died at Chinon, not Fontevault. The Illece of v. 3141 seems to imply that Richard I was killed on the crusades.

Of John we learn

"Son realme guie en bele manere,
Mais grant adversité aveit
Pur Mestre Esteven q'il ne voleit,"

From his impartial tone, the author apparently attached no blame for the Interdict either to John or to Pope Innocent, "mult par seint hom." It did not last "sis anz et treis quartiers et un mois" but $5\frac{1}{2}$ years, while the nondescript "evesché" mentioned as the cause of the trouble was merely the archiepiscopal throne. "Mestre Esteven" therefore seems the only guilty party, perhaps because his lead in the securing of Magna Charta was offensive to the sense of loyalty already noted in our author. The troubles with the barons and the invasion of the Dauphin Louis were no doubt part of John's "bele manere", and quite normal to the author's scheme of things.

Of Henry III we learn simply that in his time took place the battle of Lewes, where he lost many relations, and the battle of Evesham, where Simon de Montfort, Henry his son and Hugh Despenser are neatly rhymed off; no mention of the causes which led to the rising of the barons against the King, so that there can be no question of stirring old wounds in this Chronicle, at a time when King and barons are united against an outside foe.

As a further index of the author's historical accuracy may be briefly noted his monkish insistence on the places of death and burial of the Kings, even when he has only a few words to say of their whole reign. His favourite burying-places are London and Winchester, but he is nearly always wrong. Neither Aethelstan nor Edgar, for example, found rest at London, as he says, but the former at Malmesbury, the latter at Glastonbury. This mistake

about Edgar, the great benefactor of Glastonbury, makes it extremely unlikely that the ms originated there. If, however, to do the author justice, we read for Alvered not Alfred but Aethelred, it is correct to say that he died at London, and it is quite possible that the paradoxical English nation gave him a hero's funeral at St Paul's. Pierre de Langtoft calls Aethelred Eylrode or Aylrode, and the Cotton Vitellius ms of the Brut inters him at St Paul's, as does William of Malmesbury. Robert of Gloucester, however, so far from burying Aethelred at St Paul's says "Fobleliche he lliuede al is lif and deyde in feble detho." Canute and Harald Harefoot were buried respectively at Winchester and Oxford, not at London and Winchester. John, whose misdeeds the author palliates, is buried by him at Winchester, perhaps by confusion with Worgester. The same mistake appears elsewhere, for example in the Cambridge ms of the "Shorter English Chronicle". Edward I he makes die at London after wintering there, a proceeding which this King shared, according to the Chronicle, with Aethelstan and Henry I (who in fact died at Angers). Perhaps Burgh-on-Sands was so remote that the London cliché was more convenient.

So much for the Chronicler's testimony on past events. Any hopes that he might show greater historical rectitude for the reign of Edward II, of which, presumably, he saw something, as it ended about a dozen years before the date of the ms, are quickly deceived. The fifty-one lines devoted to this reign show as much confusion and inaccuracy as the rest. Like most of his predecessors, Edward was "de grant poestis" and

"..... maintint bien les franchis
De Saint Eglise, et mult l'amoit
Rentos et possessions lour doneit".

Also, probably a more personal note:

"As povres freres de religion
Sovent dona mult riche doun".

He governed his Kingdom well, and often destroyed the Scots - Bannockburn is discreetly omitted. The first of the King's favorites, Gaveston, is not mentioned, but Hugh Despenser, or L'Es-penser, is given instead as the cause of the baron's revolt. The author seems to have the impression that there was only one Despenser. Perhaps he had close knowledge of only one of them. As the elder Despenser was drawn, quartered and beheaded at Bristol, with Mortimer as one of his judges, while the younger was hanged at Hereford, the reference to Mortimer's part in the "vile huntage" may indicate the elder Sir Hugh. This perhaps means that the author lived nearer Bristol than Hereford. Significantly, he drops no word on the Queen Mother's part in all this. As there is no mention of the Despensers' burial at Tewkesbury, that town seems to be excluded as place of origin of the ms. The evidence of the final passages in favour of the Gloucester area has already been discussed; the omission of any reference to Henry III's exceptional coronation at Gloucester may oppose this. The extensive omissions noted on the subject of campaigns in Scotland and the North again seems to fix the author's habitat in the South.

The account already given of the omissions made in Wace's narrative seems to show that the chief purpose was to save space, hardly to improve historical accuracy. The same is true of many gaps in the post-Wacian story, though there is less excuse for disregard of historical continuity in times nearer to the author.

But it is hard to avoid the suspicion that other motives, perhaps of a piece with the whole purpose of the work, guided the author's manipulation of his material.

He is obviously an unswerving supporter of the Norman régime and of the idea "the King can do no wrong", by his almost automatic praise of every member of the dynasty, good, bad or indifferent, exception being made for Henry II, disturber of the Church. There might also be, in the absence of praise for Henry III and the list of barons killed at Evesham, a fleeting note of sympathy for the latter which might denote interest in the Despensers particularly. The dynasty's adopted ancestor, Arthur, has the biggest place in the story, and the author by his treatment of it seems to have little interest in the part of Wace which followed Arthur. In his own part he omits altogether the Anglo-Saxon hero, Alfred, or (wilfully ?) confounds him with the execrated Aethelred. He is careful to insist on the legality of William of Normandy's action in coming to claim his heritage, and the illegality of Harold's in seizing the throne himself; his sardonic comment on the justness of Harold's fate has already been noted. The contrast between his attitude and that of writers of Chronicles in English is marked. The Shorter English Chronicle, for example, misses out Arthur, but like Robert of Gloucester praises Alfred, expresses dissatisfaction with the foreign influences which followed the Conqueror and supports Stephen Langton and Simon de Montfort.

Our author, then, whether from impartiality or ignorance shows unusual restraint from violent criticism except in the case

of Harold, the Saxon, and Henry II, the enemy of the Church. He does not seem interested in Scotland or the North. As we have seen, Arthur's conquests there are among the major omissions, but his pretexts and preparations for continental conquest are kept at length, with, significantly, his overcoming of Frollo, governor of Paris and bearer, in the miniature, of the lilies of France. It might have been indiscreet to refer in too great detail to Scotland, scene of Edward II's failure, but the parallel of Arthur, conqueror of France and then of the world, was valuable to the King who hoped to follow in his path. There can be little doubt that this version of the Brut was intended to play a part in Edward III's war propaganda, and in the popularising of French for war purposes in accord with his ordinance of 1334. It is carefully written and lavishly illustrated, but lacks the sumptuousness which would indicate a direct royal commission or execution for a member of the high nobility. Its inaccuracy even in contemporary affairs seems to mean also that it was not written for any who had had a leading part in them or much knowledge of them; a patron among the lesser nobility of Norman descent in the West is indicated, perhaps among the followers of the Despensors,

The direct historical value of the ms is obviously small. In spite of unusual care in the actual execution, little attempt has been made to improve on such historical ^{knowledge} as might have been contained in oral tradition. It is not part of the body of English Chronicles which are, according to authorities, one of our most valuable possessions. Its indirect historical value, however, lies in showing how ignorant it was possible to be even when writing

for the pleasure and information of those classes still conversant with the polite language. By implication the latter are convicted of even greater ignorance.

Six centuries of progress in the public and those with the vocation of informing and entertaining it, hardly enable us to criticise a probably well-meaning forerunner of the historical film and the press of propaganda and sensation.

(A) PHONETICS V LANGUAGE.

The rhymes must of course provide the material for the study of this piece from the phonetic point of view, but the fact that it is based upon an older poem reduces the quantity of such material. Most of Wace's rhymes have been taken over as they stood; the changes undergone by the word-pairs in the intervening 180 years are perhaps reflected in the spelling, but as they are still good rhymes for the most part, they often do not betray the real nature of the sounds. That the author was capable of adjusting his spelling to provide eye-rhymes: (examples are given in the chapter on versification) on the one hand makes us suspicious of what may be legitimate sound-pairings, and on the other may assist in determining sound-developments which orthographical conservatism might have concealed. In any case it shows the unreality of much Anglo-Norman spelling or the uncertainty of Anglo-Norman phonology, or both. The best method of approach seems therefore to study chiefly the rhymes used in the interpolations and alterations, and in the final portion. Those shared with Wace will be indicated by W, L signifying Le Roux de Lincy's text, A Arnold's.

I Tonic Vowels

Lat. ī > Fr. i Numerous examples suggest that this sound, in other words beside verbs, had become assimilated to, or confused with, other vowels, e.g. (a) Lat. ā > Fr. e - appelé; Normandie, 3053, afeblie; passé 521, deliveré; aie 1955, loe; envaie 527, clergie; vie 642, abbeye 2802, avie; exillie 3227. (b) Lat. .ar > Fr. er - chivalhier; venir 2193, ^{Sire 2594,} volder; entreferir 2103, decoler; occire 3245, demorer; fuir 432, meintenir; justiser (noun) 3495, cunseiller 3225, fruisser; murir 1414, chalangier; meintoner

2342, meintendirent: turneront 1415. (c) Lat. \bar{o}, \bar{i} free > Fr. $oi +$ $ocis$: Daneis 573, aveit: entredit 3153.

A good number of these examples are rhymes between $i\bar{r}$ and $i\bar{e}r$ or i - $i\bar{e}r$; others may be due to change of conjugation not noted in the spelling as it is in $seis\acute{o}$: $cumpar\acute{e}$ 3069, $sigler$: $pleiser$ 2496, $seisez$ (past part.): $volez$ (vouloir) 1453. (Cf. Tanqueroy, p. 758, where he says this confusion takes place particularly before r .) Such rhymes, with spellings like $feille$, $empeirement$ (cf. $treiste$ in *Plaintes de la Vierge*), may indicate that i , less stable than on the continent, had become more open in Anglo-Norman, at least in the area to which the scribe belonged. Lui : ($avie$, 3222) is no doubt merely a spelling of li (cf. lie : vie , 3047), Lat. \bar{e}, \bar{i} free > Fr. oi . It is clear that this vowel had lost the second element of the diphthong by now in Anglo-Norman. Examples $foiz$: $parioz$, 596; $venquerez$ ²⁶³²; oir ~~2632~~ ($iter$): $mander$, 696; $aver$: $parler$, 3063; cf. the spelling $ost\acute{e}$ = $esteit$ 466. It rhymes once with $a + jod$ (moi : sai , 968). Cf. also the above rhymes in \bar{i} . Lat. \bar{a} free > Fr. je rhymes with $\bar{e} \leftarrow$ Lat. a in $frer$: eor ($heri$ 1722 $nomer$: $Pier$ ($peter$, 2925), which change seems to be confirmed by numerous spellings like $pere$ for $pierro$, $requer$, $destourber$: $mes-tier$ (1305 W). This sound also seems to rhyme with i in $cimiter$: $Ambosbire$ (1505, W $Ambresb\acute{e}re$: $cimetre$ or $Ambresbiere$: $cimetiere$, $cimetiro$), though the nature of the sound in $-bire$ is by no means certain.

Lat. \bar{a}, \bar{a} free > Fr. $e, \bar{e}(r)$. As noted above, there seem to be cases of these sounds rhyming with $\bar{i}, \bar{o}, \bar{i}$, in infinitives, preterites and past participles. Change of conjugation may be suspected in most cases, but hardly in $apell\acute{e}$: $Normundie$, $deliver\acute{e}$:

ale, venir: chivalchier, nor in tueiz: damagiez (assuming tueiz to be a word in -itium and not a misspelling of tuez). This sound also rhymes with e + l - mouillée^e -ilium in cunseil: leil (legalem, 385, cf. leal: vassal 462, W). This last rhyme seems to confirm Miss Pope's opinion (From Latin to Modern French, p. 457) that in England legalem > lel; the final il, a graphy for l- mouillée, could no doubt, owing to confusion of this with l, stand just as well for the simple sound. Cf. "the Land o' the Leal".

Lat. a + l blocked > O.F. au. In the rhyme regne: realme 3051 a l, preceded by e plus jod, seems to have undergone the same fate as when free in legalem. All trace of the l, which is still spelt, has probably disappeared in pronunciation (cf. raem in John Trevisa, West of England c. 1380).

Lat. ō blocked > Fr. o. At v. 333 Ost rhymes with the archaic imperfect amenout. Elsewhere, however, these imperfects are coupled in rhyme with those in - eit.

Lat. ō, ū free > Off. ou, Fr. oe. This sound variously spelt, is confused, as usual in Anglo-Norman, with (a) u < ō, ū blocked, (b) y > ū. Examples: (a) heure: socure (succurrat?) 407; succure (imperative): honur, 674(W); jours: honurs, 3037; (b) cure: honure 103; pruz: is#uz, 87; socuruz: dolerouse, 537; pruz: touz, 2935. The rhyme bruit: tout, 2294 is a legacy of Wace. Though the spelling is altered, it is no doubt still a good rhyme, owing to the reduction of ui to u in A-N. Cf. eussent: fuissent, 2827.

2. Nasal Vowels

There are no cases of ā: ē

Some rhymes seem to show denasalisation, e.g. treit: empeint 3079, Vindrent: firent 2987, treisoun: jour (also loss of γ ?) 1133.

3 O.F. Diphthongs and Triphthongs.

AI seems to have become Σ (Σi ?), e.g. est: plest (placet, 3259; same rhyme in Black Prince, 891), sai:moi 968, fait: toneit 3257, aver: retraire 3125 (cf. Engleterre: retrere, Black Prince 1565). More numerous examples of this are given in the section on orthography. Cf. Tanqueroy p. 755.

Ie. Despite diversity of spelling, the rhymes suggest that ie in preterites, past participles and infinitives of conj.I and in words like amistié, congié, where the i is due to the influence of a preceding palatal or dental consonant or i, had been reduced to e (or Σ before r). The converse is possible, i.e. that e or Σ had acquired a first i- element in other positions than after palatals or dentals. This latter alternative would account for the ease with which verbs change their conjugation, in view of tendencies in i - verbs which seem to be noted in spellings like oierent, oies, cumbatierent, orgoillierent, in this piece. Tanqueroy says such forms are rare (p. 749). It is to be suspected that the scribe was working from an older ms to which he gave only partial attention, as he coupled indiscriminately ie and e spellings:

- (a) where, according to Suchier's rule (les Voyelles toniques, p. 84) ie would be possible in both words, (b) where ie is not normal in one of them (c) where it is not normal in either, (d) where both words have e-spelling not normal to one of them, (e) where both words have e when ie would be normal in both. Examples: (a) de exilez: de pasciez 81, chivalers: charchiers 89, :fiers 569, envoiez: enapparaillez 115, baptised: lied 183, repairer: chargier 321, vergier: cunseiller 724, repairez: cungiéd 816, enforcier: requer 970, lessez: detrenchiez 357, meisnez: chargiez 990, amistied: meitez 1028,

milliers:volunters 1121, appareilliz (sic):aloignez 2099, dener:
mestier 2388, drescié:husché 2392;

(b) destourber:mestier (W destorbier) 1305, demorer:comencier (L
demorier, A demurer) 1409; atargier:armer 1395, mundier:espurger
1313, jetterent:enchacierent 571, enhaucier:mander 1509, valee:
essacié (W asasée) 129, enhaucié:clamé 2320, autier:coroner 255,
3105, comencié:solempnité 2220, Pier:nomer 2925;

(c) passerent:decertierent 561, ariverent:aportierent 850, Sever:
gardier 201, remuer:portier 1533, :mediciner 2762, portierent:
amenerent 1597, :donerent 1997, turnerent:cuntierent 2418, doné:
achacié 588, apportiez:enterrez 2774;
(d) doner:heriter (noun) 2977, mere:lesser 1088, dispenser:bache-
ler 3181; (e) desrainer:venger 1353, haitez:araisonez 940,
maisné:baptisé 171. The rhyme patrem:matrem occurs twice with
the spelling pier: mer(269, 1241). Cf chier:frere 3031, and bap-
tised: lied (laetum) 183.

The most significant point in the above rhymes is that only
five (Pier:nomer, doner: heriter, autier: coroner, dispenser: bache-
ler, chier: frere) occur in the Chronicle. The uncertainty between
e and ie spellings in the first part may therefore indicate occa-
sional influence of spellings from the older ms, or that the sounds
were sufficiently alike to cause confusion in the spelling. The
spelling is much more regularly e in the Chronicle, which has no
example at all of an ier infinitive. The only cases of this spelling
beside the above are millier (not at the rhyme) 2942, chantierent
(: firmament) 2-56, damagierent (:gueroient) 2986, damagiez (:tuo-
iz) 3008, chivalchierent: encroierent 3239- all examples of regular
i spelling which may easily have occurred because traditional.
Examples have already been given of the rhyming of i with e,
especially before r, though not exclusively. The cumulative effect

of these rhymes is to suggest that e, ei, ie and i in A-N all became levelled or at least, similar enough to be confused. Whether the result was a diphthong or a simple vowel seems difficult to decide. The spelling everywhere pere for pierre (Pier for the proper name, however,) manere, arere, etc. may mean reduction of ie. On the other hand, spellings like pier (pere) chier, tiel may show diphthongisation of e. Loan-words from the two classes, e.g. cheer (< chere, < cara), ^{peer (< pair < par),} pierce, pier (< pierre < petra, cf. "Piers Plowman"), certainly have the same vowel in modern English.

As far as the parts of verbs are concerned, the phonetically easiest stages, not necessarily chronological ones, seem to have been the identification of é and ié in past participles (cf ms F.f. 1450 of the Brut, a northern French one, which shows guerpie; laie, v. 6096 ed. L) ~~and commences; noncie, v. 7146~~; then of preterite endings in - erent, - ierent, whether of the first or other conjugations (cf. Tanqueray, p. 577), finally the past participles of -ey verbs rhyme with those of the second and other conjugations and with nouns, etc. in i, ie, while their infinitives rhyme with those in - ir, - ire. Examples of all these have already been given. Tanqueray (p. 383) notes that the re-introduction of -ier in the first conjugation infinitives, even in verbs not having it originally, appears to have taken place towards the end of the 14th century. It appears to have happened earlier if our ms has been correctly dated (e.g. remuer; portier 1533, mundier; espurger 1513 portier is the regular spelling for this verb and its compounds). If our ms is in advance of others in this respect, the phenomenon may be connected with its locality of origin (cf. Chapter II above). On the other hand, rhymes like remuer; portier, suggest that -ier

was only a spelling. Even more numerous examples have been given of this spelling in the third person plural of the preterite. They show that introduction of i takes place after r, t, or d without presence of i in the preceding syllable, as required by ^{Suchier's} ~~the~~ rule quoted by Tanqueray (p. 382). Ieu. The rhyme dieux: autiers 910, is another legacy from Wace (L dela: autels, A deus: auteus) The form proper to the scribe is autier(: ccroner, 255, 3106, two rhymes of his own).

4 Final Atonic e

There is ample evidence, in rhymes as well as spellings, that final atonic e had disappeared or was disregarded in A+N. Examples: mere; lesser (1088), terre: bier (baro 2864), :purloigner (1975), :mander (3017), :justiser (3265), :Espensor (3223), :Mortimer (3241); frere; bachelor (2951) ~~quatre (11026)~~; chier 3031; parler; chier (fem 1961); arer (arrêre); fier (feriat, 2551); retraire; aver (3125); frer: eer (heri, 1722); crue: vestu (fem) 892, avie: lui (3221, cf. vie: lie, le. lui, 3047); mando: purloignant (2286; demande: covenant 1657; ~~mande~~ France: anz (2931), Irlande: grant (1527); corone: Southamp-
toun 2484, seisin: fin 2867, franchis: poestis (3212, voile: doel 604, noveles: vassels 848, ~~montemport (311) ne prentier 2602~~, porte: fort 1377, tot: dout 880, etc. etc.

To these must be added the large number of lines which show past participles and other words in -é, masculine or feminine, rhyming with others in -ee, either gender, e.g. alé: rovee 1239, parlee: prié 1627, vatee: essacié 129, porté: ensevelee 13253, :melee 1137; :ensepelee 3167; espee: achevé 2110. Also the rhyming of 1 past participles, 3rd person singulars of 1-preterites and other ^{words} with final i to which an irrational e has been added, with others having no such e, e.g. seisie: tolli 549, Henry: baillie 3169.

fendi: estendie 980, guerpie: fini 1177, vestie: tendi 1661, apatie: ferri 2695, etc., etc. Verbal $\dot{\text{t}}$ ent appears to be similarly mute, except in certain cases which will be discussed in the chapter on versification. This would account for the writing of the third person singular for the plural in a number of places, e.g. cremeit: esteient 1401, aveit: teneient 2055; also the change in the imperfect ending from $\dot{\text{t}}$ eient to -eint. Further reduction to -ent owing to the change $\text{ei} > \text{e}$ is not unlikely (cf. Versification).

5. Final Consonants

Final consonants which had disappeared or were disappearing in France as well as in England, have in some cases been reintroduced in spelling, but the rhymes show that they are not pronounced.

Labials, P- corps: Hors 852 (W cors: Hors), champe: s $\dot{\text{u}}$ iant 3006
temps: parenz 3173, tense: eloquence 640.

F - nefs: remes 2001, (W nes: remes), cf. poestis: sis 3183, poestiz: fiz 3135.

V - naie: plentive 884 (W naive).

Dentals Judging from the confusion of spellings, most final dentals seem to have disappeared by now in Anglo-Norman pronunciation. D final had of course become t in O.F. (cf Edward: part 2971, 3041; Irlande: grant 1527), but both seem lost in pronunciation though often brought back in spelling: the frequency of d at the end of past participles, etc., where it might in early stages of A-N, represent the dental spirant, is probably due to the influence of English weak past participles - the rhymes indicate that the final dental had no phonetic value. Examples: regnat: onura 3121, eslit: Everwic (2939 - no doubt Anglo-Norman

convention allowed non-pronunciation of the K of the English place name), lied: acoustez 40, cunceud: bus 73, lessez: exilled 620, Crist: sis 3049. S and ts (Z) had likewise no doubt been assimilated and then silenced: the interchange of these letters in spelling (cf Dynabus: irascuz 1221, depeSCIés: exiloz 81, temps: par-enz 3173, poestiz: fiz 3135, socuruz: dolerouse 537) is enough to show assimilation; and their rhyming with a presumably orthographic d (lied: acoustez 38, preised: occisés 511, amistied: meitez 1028, tunduz: revestud 1663, Muntford: efforz 3177) and with forms without S (estrif: vifs 2262, oncumbrers: guerrier 2937) seems to indicate their loss.

Against the loss of final S, we find rhymes like pres: engres (i.e. presse, engresse) 2218, purpense: tens 2626, franchis (franchises): poestis 3212, assis (i.e. assise): justise 1953. Apart from purpense: tens, however, which shows addition of analogical e; in spelling at least, these rhymes prove little else than the loss of feminine e: where this loss had taken place, the S was no doubt still pronounced but this was not necessarily true of S normally final, i.e. (generally) a sign of number or case. Similar considerations seem to apply to T in entent: rent (nouns) 812, atent: Juvent (do) 1971, where the t, not properly final, was no doubt pronounced, though ^{without} a final off-glide marked enough to be spelt.

Perhaps the spellings -ce, -se; -sse indicate words in which final S had not been lost, acquiring an e in spelling to show the remnant of an off-glide. Usually these words rhyme together, e.g. pretance: romance 986, tense: eloquence 640, but there is also force: aforce (efforz?) where the pronunciation is not in doubt. If these spellings thus represent sounded final S, the rhymes in

question and bretance:geanz 1607, France: anz 2931, mortz; aforceo 2734, seem to imply that S and z final had not fallen. Perhaps they had disappeared in most words, and certainly as signs of declension, but could sound if required by rhyme. They were certainly interchangeable in spelling whether pronounced or not.

That S before final T had been effaced appears certain from the prevalence of st as the ending of the third person singular of the preterite, extending also to the future. Further confirmation comes from the following rhymes - jut:mo^rust 1189, dit; enquist 1014, apris (W's 11 ap^rist is changed to l'ad apris, so the word is indubitably the past participle); surist 1032, ost; ame-
nout 333, prist; Judit 2929, ad; dev^rast 3029, regnant 3065, mer-
cast:receut 2093.
rast 2462; ferast 1080; pout:fust 55, est^rast; dust 1683, prest:ent 2436, Estro; Gloucestre 213; Cice^rstro (W) 702, does not conclude for or against pronunciation of S, as probably A-N convention allowed the suppression of S in these English place names. Cf baptismo:creme 2857.

R The disappearance of r seems registered in a good number of rhymes - ordiners: senez 1481, assez: nomez(infin) 2452, ordeinez: (past part.): justinerz 2602, prest:ert, treisoun: jour 1133. There is also the common confusion, in spelling at least, between r and l in apostolls: gloirs 165.

L is often written where it has clearly been vocalised - russeaus: muncoals 2704, vassas: mals 1718. It has disappeared from fiz - : poestiz 3135, sis 3183, gontis: cunquis 2168. It seems to be an inverted spelling for u in words where it is not etymological, e.g. nevolz:pruz 2480, pout: solt 11187. (cf Popq. 459). It seems to

remain in voile (voeu):doel 604, and to be levelled with l-mouillée in feels:cunseilles (W) 2322 (where ille is evidently a souvenir of l-mouillée, even if the Anglo-Normans were incapable of the sound), and leil:cunseil.

Nasals. N seems to have doubtful value in treisoun:jour, sojourne:haiour 2742. Still more is this the case of n-mouillée - sojourne:Burgoine 2716, home:essoigne 2544, regne:realme 3056, aime:pleine (subjunctives of aimer, plaindre, 946. W has aint:plaint - the scribe has evidently kept the old rhyme while writing modern forms; the same seems to apply to rames:meins 2244), femme:regne 1799, 2482 (fenne:regne in Wace, a rhyme possible in S. Normandy, Champagne and Provence, where m assimilated to n instead of the normal reverse process, according to Miss Pope, From Latin to Modern French, p. 148).

(B) ORTHOGRAPHY.

Tanqueroy, in the Introduction to his Evolution du verbe postulates unity of language in any given Anglo-Norman work, whether of the eleventh or of the fourteenth century; despite the rapid changes in the language, that of any one work is fairly homogeneous. Such a piece as the present, derived though not slavishly copied from an older work, might be expected to upset this view by its mixture of features proper to its author and those of only a few years earlier. On the whole, however, its surprising degree of consistency only serves to confirm the view put forward by Tanqueroy.

It is perhaps in its orthography that this consistency is most conspicuous. Fluctuation and irregularity are of course present, but chiefly in the representation of those sounds on whose value uncertainty was greatest for the Anglo-Normans, and particularly some which have already been discussed. Where an apparently irregular spelling is repeated, as is often the case, there was no doubt a phonetic basis, though scribal tradition may obscure its nature.

There is some evidence of care for rules such as those drawn up in the Orthographia Gallica, which were sometimes well-founded but were often fanciful enough to show the complete divorce of spelling convention from phonetic reality. Habet, for example is without exception distinguished from ad by use of the spellings ad, a. There are only a few exceptions to the use of e after c to denote softening before a, v, u, and none of its omission after g in these circumstances. -ast is almost generalised as the 3rd pers. sing. ending of the preterite. Numerous words of sometimes unusual form keep this form everywhere without varia-

90

tion, e.g. besoigne, chivaler, chivalchier, primer, soul, feillo poi, solonc.

Vowels: e, ie.

The question of the spelling *ie* has already been discussed from the phonetic viewpoint. The fact that it is rare in the Chronicle, even in words where we might expect it, e.g. *commencé* 3085, 3263, *justiser* 3196, 3266, *chivalherent* 3236, suggests that it was not proper to the Egerton scribe; to the support of rhymes like *dispenser: bachelor, autier; coroner, doner; heriter* come spellings like *desirez (desiriers)* 1860, *meisné, passim, litere: bierre* 1896 *derere* 1576, *veilles (viells)* 290, *veillards* 93, and many others already cited. Whether this means that phonetically *ie* tended to become *e*, while in turn *e* tended to change to *ie*, as in *chier, chief* and the numerous examples above quoted (but cf. *chier: frere* 3032), or whether again they were just variable graphies for indeterminate sounds, it is difficult from such evidence to conclude.

Spellings without *e* where we expect it are: *oiz* (imperative) 2620, *apparailiz* (past participle) 2099.

Ö, O, OU, U

The sounds coming from the Latin *Ö, Ō, Ū* and *Ū* were perhaps those on which the Anglo-Normans felt the greatest uncertainty, and this is reflected in the spelling. Thus **tottu* is spelt *tot, tout, tut* with the first perhaps predominant; at v. 1820 there is *trestout*. *Keurent* at v. 2145 is the present of *courir*. *O* at the beginning of v. 562 seems to stand for *ou*. *O* in countertonic position likewise varies: *oustoz* 603, *oustages* 1490, *adourer* 1504, *ovreine* 1522, *restorer* 1503, *morir* 1683, *corone passim, dotant* 740, *honuré* 1518, *murdrie* 1508 - perhaps *O* receives the preference.

O.F. *ö* likewise ranges through *eo*, *oe*, *o*, *ou* to *u* - *geor* 593, *doel* 605 *poep* 759, *pueple* 184, *ovre* 1528, *avoglo* 3063, *soul* *passim*, *overours* 1510, *dolur:plour* 1714, *lour*, *lur* *passim*, *gule* 1702, *goule* 1326, *honor* *passim*. *Locum* gives *lu* 132, *lou* 1509, *leue* 1524, *lieu* 2290; *focum* > *feu* 1342, ^{fu} 2557; *dui* > *diou* 854. The weight of numbers seems in favour of *ou*. *U* shows similar range: *escomer* 1325, *estoet:creut* 265, 1683, *estuēt:mut* 1585, *tresboucher* 2117.

O.F. Diphthongs.

The evidence of the spelling, as of the rhymes, is in favour of the levelling of *ai*, *ei*, *oi* (to open *e*?). The only exception to *pacem* > *pees*, (*pes* 1999, *pees* 2871) is *pais* 98, 1937, 2001, 3163. Cf. *paissiblement* 1878. The past participle of *faire* is habitually *fait*, but rhymes with *teneit* 3257, *veit* (*aller*) 1287, *treit* (*tractum*) 1367, *pleit* 699. The infinitive and the imperative singular are also spelt *faire*, *fai* without exception, with *fas* as second person singular at v. 1295. But the *e* spelling is found invariably in *fetes* or *fetez*, and in the present participle and imperfect. The first person singular of *savoir* (which alternates with *saver* and rhymes with *veer*, 1515) is always *sai*, the second has *ses* 2263, *sees* 1230, *seiez* 1226, *soiz* 1535, or *siez* 2266. For the 3rd pers. sing. of *aller* we find *veit* 1288, *voit* 1864. *peser* gives *peise* and *poise*, *taire*, gives *tes* 1223, *plaire* *plost* *passim*; *lessor* has *e* invariably. *Feible* and its compounds are always spelt with *e* only, and *tresun* 1911, 3013, seems to show that even *i* in hiatus had been lost, in spite of the spelling *traître*, 3009 and elsewhere. *Seisir* always keeps *ei*, however; *kei* appears for *quoi* at v. 1304, and *moi:sai* 968, *tey* 1819, *estrais* appears at v. 3156, *estraitement* 1260. The 3rd person

sing. pres. subjunctive of avoir is ait 102, eit 104, Magis has become mes at v. 105, magistros mestres at 230. Compare also the spellings autreit (autre, autri?) 2091, receiveit 2059, receiveri-ent 844, citizeins 2144, ensepeillez 3188, orgoins 2222, orgoiner 2223. The matter seems to be clinched by the free rhyming of the different imperfect endings, as veneit:appareilloit 2598, amoit:doneit 3213, fereint:savoient 730.

For eie, compare espeie 2200, 2211, valeie 2600, with abbé (abbaye) 3115.

The evidence seems in favour of the loss of the second element in oi, ui, e.g. su passim, conusaunce 47, conustre 55, conuse (imperative singular) 1247, cundure 492, destruent 619, 927, agenuler 1011, 1469, anuer 1076, emposoner 1110, rusele 1314, somuler 2502; on the other hand there are a few spellings like fruissier 1413, puisun 1356. Reduction seems to have left the i - element in autri 603. There is no clear distinction between lui and li in the dative-disjunctive form of the personal pronoun: there seem to be few cases of lui in the counter-tonic position, but more of li in the strong position after a proposition, e.g. vv. 245, 2077.

Atonic e . Examples already given show that there is no consistent use of final "e mute" in past participles etc., or observation even of the curious rules to be found in the Orthographia Gallica. It is added to the masculine perhaps more often than to the feminine: respundue: eue 1237 are past participles not susceptible of agreement; the rhyme esgardee (fem): tourné (maso) 1801, might suggest that agreement was observed at least in spelling, if exposee: amé (both fem.) 1871, did not show that

such an idea is quite wrong, and that the most probable reason for such spellings is to diversify the appearance of the ms. - the ending - ee only appears once, 291-2, at the end of two consecutive verses. At the end of many nouns, e.g. champe: suiant 3005, it is obviously irrational. A possible explanation of some irrational es is suggested in the chapter on versification.

The regular spelling of -eement in adverbs and nouns in -ment may be intended to denote that counter-tonic e is pronounced, and not effaced as usual, e.g. boneement 99, definetment 146, sureement 975, priveement 1818, cel^eement 1398, primoreement 753, - in forement 1706, 1322, the e is quite an intruder and presumably not pronounced. If the scribe had such a rule in mind, however, he broke it very frequently, e.g. finoment 152, chier~~te~~, ensement, passim, delivrement 1863, Chier^{te} 2082, ²⁸⁹⁴registers disappearance of counter-tonic e, and pers: frers 750-1, of final e. Agglutination is sometimes shown by the omission of e - entre- rels passim, sometimes not - s'entreassemlerent 1932, There is regular diacritic use of e after c and g before a, o, u, with only four exceptions for c - enlocumez 1646, facoun 2508, pollicoun 2233, macue 2560. The frequency of the ending- ea thus obtained in preterites like chacea, embracea, may be responsible for its use in bailea: baisoa 1034, engrotea 3132, movea 3192. Engrotea may be due to similarity of t and c in writing; the e in the first two examples may represent a lost (?) i, but movea seems to have no reason save analogy or possibly English spelling influence. Cf. Tanqueray's examples p.574. The frequency of diacritic e in u-verbs like cunceud, recent, may have caused its

intrusion by mistake in venceud 470.

S replaces e final in guers 759.

I seems written for l (<u?) in provoitz 301, poice 1671; of
 Vowels plus Nasals vois 1282, and Pope p.459

Aun, oun, only occur sporadically: the latter more frequently, perhaps more so than on: the usual graphy for \tilde{O} is un. There is no regularity about these spellings, France, for example occurring 16 times ^{to twice} for Fraunce. They rhyme together without distinction. Ont prefers the O-spelling to any other, though there are four cases of unt and one of ount 623. On the other hand sunt is always spelt with u, no doubt through Latin influence, The favourite spelling for nomen is noun: as it still survives, it was no doubt the current form.

There are only three examples of interchange of a + nasal ^{and e + nasal}: an ^{ranges 2103, 2165.} 1426, chalangier 2396, As already noted the rhymes show no case of confusing \tilde{a} and \tilde{e} . N seems almost to be preferred in spelling before labials, e.g. enpointe 1577, embrace 113, enpoint 3080, enport 2663, enporte 3015, enpres passim, but sempres, emporere etc. passim, emposoner 1110. Also emflast 1925,

N is omitted in U cuire 974, Icubi 1273. There is the common omission before V in covable (convenable) 1186, covenant 1658, coveitous 1660 -the English words show that denasalising was a fact

Consonants

C is commonly written for S, as in ces for ses, passim, ceo for se(demonstrative for reflexive) 1676, ^(? cf. p. 130) 1895, 3105, c'ills, c'il, for s'ills, s'il passim; ces = si les 1812. Ce appears at the end of many words for S, as already noted-probably confusion with the ending of nouns coming from Latin words in -tia. C stands for qu in unc 1236, annes 1264, c'ills 1202, ascuns 368; for ch in sacont

773, encarchier 1210, cerchant 2546; though chastel is commonest, there also appear castel 1814, Kastel 562, showing the northern pronunciation which remains in English. Ch is commonly written for K or qu - Pasche 2164, arcevesches 2196. There is the common substitution of C for T in blanc 221. Cf the rhyme eslit; Everwic. 2939.

C intrudes into the spelling of cunctes 301, cunctee 858. K appears everywhere for q, qu in ki, ke, kant, evaskes, unkes 1241, aukes 1257, nekeden 2145, kerneus 626, Pask 1785, kei (quoi) 1282, 1304; for c in kist 988. It is written for l in kes 626, cf. le for ke 1834. After q, u is omitted everywhere except in quorir and its compounds, which may be a sign that the sound kw remained here. U is never omitted after g in guerre and its compounds.

R Examples of the apparent disappearance of r have already been given, found in spelling as well as in rhyme. There is interchange with l in Frandres 2606, forcelette 450.

The 1st p.s. of the future of aller is invariable irrai, while dire has dirrai once 158. Cf. Tanqueray, p.707. Durrai 1653, durras 1652, merrai 2292, lerras 2388 are regular forms, but être and faire also have rr: serrad 1355, serra 2957, serrunt 1938 et al., serreit 781, 961, ferreit 363. S is spelt sc occasionally; as pascez 1973, depescier 81, pruesce 2630 (cf. pruez 2624 also = prouesse 17, resceuz 2146. The spelling of intervocalic voiceless S with one S is extremely common, perhaps more so than that with SS, e.g. rassemblez 79, lisuz 88, assembler 91, resembler 918, asoz 945, ausi 1886, asaille passim, garniseit 2076, languiseit 1636, veises 624 et al., donase 962, fusement 862 etc.etc. If this implies voicing as in modern orthography, it would be a further argument in favour of a West-of-England origin for the ms: the English pronunciation

of dessert, resort, unison, resource, resemble, etc., seems to make it possible that the spelling does imply voicing, but the tendency was no doubt strongest in the West-Saxon area. Comparison of the spelling *decesse* 2872 with the English pronunciation suggests that the scribe's spellings are an index of pronunciation. *Paissiblement* 1878, *curteisse* 1959, are no doubt "inverted" spellings.

-) As the ending of the 3rd p.s. of conj. I preterites greatly outnumbers - a; -ist seems to share the author's favour with -i or -ie in other conjugations, while in the u- preterites asigmatic spellings prevail. It thus appears very difficult to distinguish any rule of spelling which the scribe may have been observing in these endings - the evidence of the rhymes already quoted shows at any rate that the S had no phonetic reality. These endings are perhaps the cause of the spelling *Reist* (*Reis*) 231.

A number of cases of *le* for *les* (e.g. 895, 1769, 2498- "*le gentz aloient*") *les* for *le* 1081, *de* for *des* (e.g. 1227, 574, 2255) *a* for *as* (e.g. ~~2404~~ 2806, 3045) and *as* for *al* 252, ^{for a} 2690, are no doubt due to the fall of final S from pronunciation. So also *donase* 2nd p.s. 962.

Z Evidence has already been given of the common interchange of s and z final and their probable sharing of the same offacement in most cases. *Meinz* (manus) 2211, shows there was often no question of representing ts. The *Orthographia Gallica*, quoted by Miss Pope p. 459, attempted to systematise the use of Z, but no system is distinguishable in the present ms. The presence of Z at the end of many past participles concluding the verse seems usually decorative. Thus in the space of a few lines we find *posez; lioz* (nom. plur. masc.) 1779, *vengex; passez* (nom sing. masc.) 1781, *espousez;*

97

privez (fem.plur.) 1789, entrez (nom.plur.masc.); gastez (fem.sing.) 1883; also conquetez (acc. sing.masc.); venez 435. Final -tz is almost as common as plain z, e.g., dentz 222, gentz passim, mortz 1760, effortz 1760, encoinementz; presentz 1803, despitz; descunfitz 1559. Z occurs at the end of a fem. acc. sing.noun in citez 1465. In the same line Z is apparently equivalent to ce in piez. Cf. liz (lice? 2089. Wace had "l'ille").

D Beside the many past participles ending in d, no doubt through English influence, there are instances of its addition at the end of other words, e.g. somonde (3rd p.s.) 2280, (cf. Somon 1788) Symond 3177. This again seems an English, particularly a South-Western, tendency, as in sound and other words. Cf. Reist 231.

Double consonants. No general statement on these seems possible, except to say that in a majority of cases the simple consonant seems preferred. Occire varies about equally between one and two Cs, but acorder always has one. P is sometimes double (suffrir 24 offert 244), sometimes single (sufroir 320, sufrir 1417 afoit 306). Ll seems preferred in meller and apeller, but tolli is more usual than entollie 8. Cf. vatee 129, valetz 710. Mm is rare, occurring occasionally in ho^mme, femme, summe 137, but m is more prevalent, in nomer, comander, coment, comencier etc.. Double n does not occur. P and pp alternate in words like appeler, apparailier. T is preferred in battre and its compounds, tt in jeter (perhaps with some notion of denoting the nature of the e). Compare attargeant 316, atargier 1395, attreit 1377, atreit 1378, recette < receptum 970.

Consonnes mouillées. As usual, l- mouillée is variously represented - l, ll, illi, ille. Single l, with or without i, seems the commonest, e.g. feille 106 et al., cunseller 318, aparaleit 421, allours

374, ~~aille~~ 623, veilles (veills, 290 cf. veillard 93), oile 2261, mail-
 four 1187; somuler 2502, agenuler 1469, merveilleuse passim. Appa-
 railler seems to be about equally divided between l and ll. Ll
 seems preferred when final, e.g. cunseille passim, orgoille 2260.
 Cf. cunseil; leil 385. In cervelle 2141, Averille 2174, the gra-
 phy for l- mouillée takes the place of l.

N- mouillée is very frequently spelt n (in), while gn general-
 ly but not invariably stands for n after i, as proscribed by Or-
 thographia Gallica. Examples: enginer 1544, greinour 803, chive-
 taine (:Bretagne) 1717, Gascoyn, Auverno, Burgoine 2155-6, pleine
 (plangat) 947; bosoigne passim, poigne 1776, dedeigne 1900, fun-
 taigne 1921, overaigne 1194, gaigne 2044 (gaine 103). The Irish (†)
 word gaine appears once with G, 3143, and once without 3079, Reine
 is once written with G, 2483. Ng is the spelling in hange (haine)
 1108, Lorenge 2157.

In Vegneient, prenge, etc. we seem to have a phonetic change
 due to the influence of the subjunctive, (cf. Tanqueroy, p. 806.)

Assimilation.

Orthography commonly shows vowel assimilation, but there are
 few examples among consonants. Many of the cases below show that
 Anglo-Norman at least spelt alike numerous vowels which had un-
 dergone dissimilation in O.F. e.g. sojourn < sejour(n), honor
 < enor.

Examples; e > i in cimiter 1506, medicine 1647, ^{mediciner 2763,} gisir 1680
 2705, espiriz 1712, Cf the common raising of e to i, (a) after
 palatal in chivaler passim, chivalcher passim, chivalerie 3084,
 chivetaine 553, 1717, achiverast 1290, (b) in intertonic syllable
 -cunjurisun 1588, damideu 187, ordiners 1481, (c) in other posi-
 tions-primer, primorement passim, diffendre 667 et al., difendud
 469, difencion 635, discendirent 627.

e > a in initial and counter-tonic syllables - aparceut 43 et al., manacent 838, manacier 1549, asalez 1571, darain 3100, aage 362, achacie 589, achater 2896, anuez 1076, imparat 689, Cf ma acorderai 1858, sa acorderast 2040, erier 2043.

e > o in initial syllables- besoigne passim, solom, solonc 1896, 2171, poor (pavorem) 1138, 1614 cf pour 1105) provost 1239, sojour-nast 2148, Cf. sucurs, succure, plusurs, etc. passim.

The above spellings seem frequent enough to imply actual pho-netic tendencies. Words which remain in English, like chivalry, ori-son, assay, provost succour, sojourn seem to give confirmation.

Dissimilation.

Counter-tonic i often becomes e: feny 188, fenist 1723, fine-roit 1338, regherai 1256, eloc 1851, gentelement 1838, (cf, gen-tement 867) Phelippo 3162.

e < a in vassels 849, aloignez 2100, sarmonant 2853, aforce 212 et al., guarir 1673.

a < e in maledie 3205, ? s'entre sailerent 1323, orrer (arer) 1488, lemont 2957.

o < o in dolorouse 538, demelines 186.

Cf. also uncore 484, developé 2250, aitant passim.

Ida Wirtz notices this last form seven times in the Hanover ms.

Metathesis: not already common in O.F. is not much in evidence in the vowels: the proper name Gillamorus is an example; perhaps also monaile (monial) 1661, ehposoiné 1912, but more probably these are absent-minded spellings.

In consonants there is the proper name Gafan for Fagan, 168; other possible examples are fiz (fist) 2708, provoitz 301, estre (ester) 1621, destempré 1678.

100

Apheresis. Ne te maior 1726, seems an example.

Perhaps also s'entre sailerent 1323, si tu as cumplis 1655, se traire, 1367, sa fermeté (for enfermeté) 1894.

Hiatus. There are three cases of the use of h to show hiatus- hahie 352, regherai 1256, trahez 1581,. The proper name Johan 2940,-3, 3147, 3165, seems uncertain; the question of the loss or preservation of hiatus seems best considered in the chapter on versification.

(C) MORPHOLOGY

DECLENSION, (a) Nouns

Numerous examples of correct declension are found, but as incorrectness is about equally prevalent, the proper use of cases, if not a matter of luck, seems due rather to the example of the model than to any particular respect for grammar on the part of the author of this ms. The use of correct case forms is certainly commoner in the first 2900 lines than in the remainder. Possibly the existence of distinctive forms inherited from Latin declension is still realised, but they have come to be looked upon less as a factor in expression, requiring to be carefully observed, than as an aid to variety and perhaps to rhythm and rhyme. Since by this time only a select few of continental writers, headed by Froissart, are able to wield their cases correctly, our

Anglo-Norman writer is perhaps entitled to some indulgence.

The common word reis, always respectfully spelt with a capital, is a good example of the author's practice. In the part based upon the Brut, the proportion between the nominative singular with S and the nominative without is roughly three to one (99 cases of Reis or Rois to 35 of Rei or Roi). In the last part the proportion is reversed (5 cases of Reis or Rois to 13 of Rei or Roi). The number of examples of incorrect usage in the Brut would be reduced considerably if those occurring in (apparently) original passages were not counted (e.g. "dit le Roi", v.435). The plural and the oblique cases (including ten examples of the genitive without preposition) are managed quite correctly throughout, with one exception: at v. 836 the nominative appears for the accusative - "Reis se fist".

Other appellatives and common words show some survival of correct declension. Emperero (emperor, emperaire) occurs six times compared with three examples of empereum as nominative singular; two of the latter (vv. 2598, 2640) are in non-Wacian lines. The accusative is regularly empereour (seven examples). As the word does not appear in the final portion, no comparison is possible.

The use of Sire is fairly regular. It occurs seven times (apart from the English title Sir in the Chronicle) as nominative vocative singular, with seignour, seignur for the oblique cases at vv. 821, 828, 1368, 2303. The vocative plural at v.1300, however, shows an S.

Our author seems to owe the declension of Quiens to his model. The regular nominative occurs seven times in the Brut and not at all in the Chronicle, where the accusative form is

used (v. 2989) for the nominative. So also vv.1847, 1849, an original passage.

Baro undergoes varying fortunes. Bier, the nominative, occurs thrice at the rhyme (vv. 1451, 2863, 2873), but at verse 233, an interpolation, baron is used for the nominative singular. Eleven cases of baron as nominative plural occur, all of them in the Brut; barons, however, is used four times as nominative plural in this part, nine times (including the form barones) in the Chronicle.

Similarly homo: the nominative singular hom, om, em, on or um occurs 13 times (three at the rhyme) while home is three times accusative singular (vv. 462, 530, 1203), twice nominative plural (vv. 93, 180-influence of English men, or of Wace?) and four times nominative singular (vv. 107, 737, 2477, 3224). The last example is of our course in the Chronicle, the last but one in an interpolation.

Traître is twice nominative singular (762, 3009) once accusative (723) and once acquires analogical S (1690). Ly Eveskes, nominative plural (636) li arceveske, (650) and cist bon Arceveskes (644) both nom. sing. are further indices to our author's consistency in declension. Neco appears regularly as the nom. sing. masculine, with neveu neveu as acc. Campaignu is acc, sing (1157, 1396) or nom. plur. (2315, 2317) but the insertion of cumpoine as acc. sing. for Wace's Breton (1152) shows that there is no real feeling for declension. No doubt this is true also of dragun, five times nom. sing to one case with S, apostolls, nom. sing 165; apostaille, acc. 161, dat. 2861, appears to be correct. Fiz or fitz is everywhere indifferently nom. or acc.

There are, it is true, a fairly large number of Nominative-vocative singulars regularly ending in S, mostly in the first part e.g. Ducs 434, 2190, surnons 715, pers (peres 750), viens 777, latiners 1019, diables 1038, eirs (iter 348), espiriz 1712, vassas 1718, feus 1380, 1699), ordiners 1481, cosins 1764, chivala (2106, followed soon after by three examples of chival acc.) chivalers 51, amis 774, senechale, hotelers 2654, poeples 2846. Vertuz 1344, coifs 2127, appear to be acc. sing.

A number of nominative plurals, also, show absence of S: ami 1025, amy 2968, 3056, escud 22, guise 150, chose 837, frere 842, veilland 93, veisin 1237, cunseiller 1181, quereour 1213, devineour 1289, 1307, eir (heres, 1351), flambe 1384, ~~chivala~~ 2106, messagier (121, 2418, 2423 - cf. messagers 2302) franchise 3125). Whether such plurals, when etymologically correct, are due to feeling for declension, to accidental omission of S, or to the influence of English strong plurals, we are left to form our own conclusions. Chivaler (:encuntrer) 2731, is acc. plur.

Some remnants of declension are also observable in the proper nouns, though most are undeclined. Dieux, which is not accorded the capital vouchsafed to Reis, is regularly nom. sing. in seven places (vv. 258, 1683, 1714, 2011, 2361, 2653, 2721) with the form dieuz in the Chronicle 3258. The nom. plur. is diou at v. 179, but dieux is nom. plur. at v. 1472, acc. plur. at v. 910; the acc. or gen. sing. is deu or dieu (nine examples). Diou also occurs twice as nom. sing. in the Brut 1252, 1444, and six times in the Chronicle. The compound Damideu seems to be undeclined. Arviragus (nom.) alternates correctly with Arviragun (acc.) perhaps because of its Latin form. But his enemy Hamon never appears with the nom. Ham or Haim which he has in Wace. Similarly

Lucy nom. 183, spoils the effect of Luces nom. 154. Guincelins is correctly nom. at v. 642, 688, but without S at v. 644. Cosa has the curious acc. Cosant at v. 1772, Cosa at v. 1879- cf. Conant 2776, Costanz, 711, is nom., Cosant gen. 741. Pascens is four times nom., once acc; the latter case twice appears as Pascent. Eldolfs has S only once (v. 1161) in four appearances in the nominatives, Octaves, correctly declined in Arnold's text, is invariable here.

In plurals there is also uncertainty. Romein, or Romeins is four times nom. plur. 614, 320, 607, 2055 but it is also nom. sing. once 582, while Romeins appears three times as the nom plur. 57, 2327, 2688, . Bretun shows 14 cases of nom. plur. without S, against 10 with S; At v. 1019 Bretun has been substituted for the correct nom. sing. Brez found in Wace. The Saxons are slightly better declined: six various spellings without final s are nom. plur., while only four nom. plur. have S, 1937, 1950, 2784, 2811.

(b) Adjectives

Declension of adjectives is preserved to some extent, again more consistently in the Brut proper than in the Chronicle, suggesting conscientious copying rather than real competence in grammar.

In the singular, nuls usually shows correct declension, as: nuls, nominative masculine, 55, 777, 1158, 3164, nul acc. 2064; but the latter form is nom. masc. (pronoun) at v. 1150 and elsewhere, fem at v. 886. Similarly tiels, nom. masc., 408, 1211, but tiel, 18; senez 1482, sened 1045; beaus 774, beals 3046, beau 882; gentils 1673, gentiz 2924, gentil 882, 1451, 2873; morz, mortz, mort passim; nez or neez is nom. or acc. passim; meire, 732, 872, greindre 319 are correctly asigmatic, probably by accident.

The nom. masc. of words in -osus usually ends in e, as maliciouse 273, orgueilleuse 274, dolerouse (Plur.) 538, pitouse 676, plourouse 677, merveillouse passim. Though there are a fair number of examples of correct usage in the Chronicle, as: gentiz, nuls, beals above, pruz 2935 et al., poestiz 2996 et al., they are all common words, and less numerous than nominatives like saint 2925, seinte 3158, bele 2952, bon 2967 etc. etc. Acc. singulars like quels 1348, nuls 881, vifs 2263, granz 710, show there was no real understanding of the rôle of S.

Correct use of e for the feminine is less frequent than its absence - nule 6, longe et lee 1485; but nul 886, cremu 239, gent 124 et al., beal 124 et al., malveis 700, né 709, chier (parker) 1962. Tele 238, and qele 785 et al., sometimes have analogical e; even in the masc. 909, but grant is invariable for both genders.

There is a curious frequency of final e in masc. accusatives (as: bone 1071 et al., tote 8, 791 et al., commune 13. q^uele 730, brefe 843, novele 1001, certeine 1345) or neuter (e.g. bone 1483). It is difficult to decide whether this was the result of some obscure rule, of confusion with feminine forms, of metrical considerations, or of chance.

The plural shows the same mixture of correctness and confusion. Though at first sight fort 431, 898, 1412 et al., sage 410, rebaudi 467, grant 414 et passim, melior 898, plusur 1214, tot 703, et al., totel 1007, petit 731, and others suggest that the assignatic nom. plur. was known, there are probably as many others with S, e.g. tuz 1633, lagians 1059, alkuns 548, tiels 371. These accusatives without S, like vaillant 918, fait 869, mort 432,

tote 1860, grant 1714 et passim, jolouse et lied 1365, show that there was little understanding of French rules and a probable influence from English undeclined adjectives. For fem. plurals there are toutz 1503, destruit 1502, cunquis (: gentis, masc. plur) 2168. Complete declensions like " li gentil bier" 1451, and others given above, sufficiently confirm the haphazard nature of declension in this piece.

Possessives. Variety is again the keynote. The nom. sing. masc. sis is very frequent 107, 153, 147, et al., tis 750, 1291, with the plural mi 1289, 2315, ~~mi~~ et al. But there are also for the nom. sing si 2106, 1521 (? si gent; purrent), mun 781, sun 143, 4, ~~sun~~, 1837, 2041 and passim in the Chronicle, while sun is plural at v. 1999. The frequent use of sun, tun with fem. nouns 195, 755, 1171 et al and sa for masc. 152, is no doubt due to usual Anglo-Norman weakness on gender.

Demonstratives. Cel is the normal masc. sing. but it is fem. at v. 333; and celeris both masc. and fem. 131, 605 et al., while celc serves for both genders in the plural 136, ~~celc~~. Cf icel jour 856 icele tense 640 icel oure 2953. Cil seems reserved as nom. masc. pronoun, but cils mestiers 2204. Ceste is used for both genders 810, 821, 877, 984 but the masc. also has cest 822, cist 644, Kist 988. The neuter pronoun ceo is used as demonstrative adjective, all the examples being with fem. nouns: 1302, 1406, 1443.

Numerals. The regular nom. sing. masc. uns appears as the accusative at 357, 369, with une at 833, 1203. Cf the use of s and e in accusatives noted above. For the fem. un is perhaps commoner than une.

Duo is hardly ever written in full, but a regular nom.

dieu, appears at v. 854, while it seems to be correctly declined in combination with ambos; nom. ambedieu 1629, acc. ambedous 255, 1244. We have to compliment the author on the fact that the first two examples are apparently his own contributions.

(C) Pronouns.

Personal Pronouns. Different forms of the third person singular masc. ~~who~~ nom. are el 1124, els 282, ils 1553. Cil, sing. or plur., though sometimes spelt with s, is found everywhere as subject of a verb, and seems merely the equivalent of il, ils, though there is sometimes demonstrative force. Eal is a common spelling of the fem.. For the third person plur. masc. nom. il and ils seem about equally numerous, comp. 578, 579, 1191 with 343, 768, 1130.

In accusative forms li often appears for le, 113, 163, 977 etc.etc., while le is written for the dative, 1032, 1237 etc.etc., Les is similarly used for lur, 568, 1915; also for le, 1081, though this is probably a clerical error - the next word begins with s. There seems to be no distinction between li and lui; both are used as datives and as disjunctives after preposition, though li seems to preponderate. Vv. 3259-61 show four varieties of li:

Après li regne sun fiz qe or est,
Ke Dieu li garde se li plest,
Edward li noble conquerour.

The disjunctive forms mei, tei, sei are commonly used in the unaccented position before verbs. Cf. vv. 1705, 1706, 1707, 1710.

Demonstratives. Illos invariably appears as els 368, 470, 1543 et al.. The form without vocalisation of l likewise prevails in cels, though ceus appears once or twice e.g. 297, 1879, as well as cils 1231, 2700, 2903 et al.. The neuter is cil 1301, or

cele 1207. Li Uns appears regularly as the nominative, usually copied from Wace e.g. 285, 1317, 1703, but l'un is nom., 1222, and li uns is fem. plur. at v. 507.

Possessives. Soen is the sole form appearing.

Relatives. There is the usual confusion between the nom. and acc. forms, and Ki, qi and Ke, qe are used indiscriminately. There are 77 cases of Ke, qe being used for Ki, or qi (including two cases of elision 1045, 3035) but only three, 292, 1067, 1474 of the use of nom. form for the acc. - the cases of correct usage are more than twice as numerous as these abnormalities. This confusion in the relatives no doubt caused the conjunction que to be written qi at v. 838. The fact that it does not occur in the emphatic interrogative pronouns (cf. nominatives 1249, 1254, 1534; accusatives 820 1300) suggests that it was caused, partly at least, by assimilation of e and i in unstressed position. Another reason was no doubt that the English relatives that and which (though not who) were undeclined. A large number of cases of Ke for Ki occur where the verb is in the passive, as though there were some feeling that the relative was really object of the verb, e.g. 292, 427, 3079.

Ki is equivalent to le quel at v. 1312.

Indefinite Pronouns. Chescuns is correctly nom. sing. at v. 1674, but there are far more examples of chescun, e.g. 1798, 1992, Ascuns, 368, is nom. plur. (Wace has alquant). Nullus gives indiscriminately nuls, nul, nule.

(d) Articles.

Li is everywhere in correct use as nom. masc. sing. and plur., but there are also many examples of confusion. Le appears for li at least six times e.g. 422, 1600, 2224 in the Brut proper, and

eight in the Chronicle e.g. 2963, 3052, 3095; on the other hand li appears for the acc. a good number of times, e.g. 113, 184, 1841; once for the fem. acc. 2612. The reasons are no doubt similar to those suggested for the relatives,

Of a dozen cases of feminine nouns preceded by le, e.g. 1041, 1429, 1884, all save one happen to be in the accusative case. This one (le gent surent) may be the nominative plural or a case of change of gender (cf. ceo gent 1406, le gentz 2498). Similarly, most cases of masc. nouns preceded by la are accusatives e.g. 171 la Roi 317, 753, but three are nominatives and thus entitled to li: la doel 610, la pape 3157, la Realme 3011. Cf. le (pron. obj. fem.) twice at v. 2412.

Le is found as the plural at vv. 895, 1769, 2498. In the "possessive by apposition" construction, le is the usual form of the article, e.g. le gent le Roi 1843 but li at v. 1085.

There is great confusion in the enclitic forms. A appears for al 132, 2702, but al for a at vv. 182, 267, 1084, ²⁸⁶⁴1342; a for as 2806, 3045, but as for a ²⁵²2690; al for as 222, 1341, but as for al ²⁵²2495. Similarly de for del 2275, 2848, but du for de 939, 1010; de for des 95, 564, ~~771~~ 1956, 2255, but des for de ⁷⁷¹490, ⁷⁷¹991, 2321. These last phenomena may be rather a question of syntax than of morphology.

C O N J U G A T I O N

(a) **PERSONAL ENDINGS** On the whole, usage in this piece is fairly ~~xxx~~ regular and only a few examples of the chief tendencies which it shares with Anglo-Norman as a whole, with very occasional peculiarities of its own, will call for notice. The forms quoted are rarely vouched for by rhyme, and cannot be checked by the metre, but in most cases the frequency of their occurrence gives them an appearance of validity.

FIRST PERSON SINGULAR.

Final E. In the present tense of the indicative analogical e has gained all verbs of conj. I in spelling. The rhymes often contradict the spelling, but they are Wace's and not the scribe's. Examples : cunseille (consilium): merveille 1195, mande: purloign~~ant~~ 2286. Cunfort: record 2622, is an apparent exception, but recorde appears three lines later. Envoyer gives the analogical envois, 817, as in Wace. This graphical e also extends to other conjugations: cunque 816 (but requer 971), ~~xxx~~ ocie 1652, die 2821, and other tenses: vie, conuse 1253, oie, sentie (preterite) 1261-2,. Etymological e is not lost in the conditional feroie 698, but appears to be in puis 964, first pers. sing. pres. subjunctive; this is quite probably an error in Syntax. Cf. third person, below. Analogical e is not found except in trois 2625, and envois, forms of long standing in French. Final palatal appears in every example of the present tense of

///

venir, tenir, with the preceding vowel written i - vino: tinc
1473, tink 2412.

SECOND PERSON SINGULAR.

Final s. is not written in donase 962.

Beside the normal form sees 1230 sapis is written with z - seez
1535, seiez 1226, siez 2266. Z is also the ending of three
present subjunctives - garz 1348 (properly representing ts), facez
(after si, as in Wace) 2287, seiez 2282.

For the vowel in this person the following are noteworthy - fas
(faire) 1296, les (être - rare, according to Tanqueray, p. 78)
2264, 1225(?), vois (vouloir - cf. voiz, quoted by Tanqueray, p.
78) 2244 also the form of sapis, above. In vegnes 2266, preignes
retiègues 2267, the n - mouillée of the subjunctive has invaded
the indicative, unless these are subjunctives in indirect question
on the model of Latin.

THIRD PERSON SINGULAR.

Final e is often omitted in the present (a) indicative (b) subjunc-
tive. Examples: (a) salt 1451 (non-Wacian passage) engros (:
pres, i.e. ~~xxxxx~~ presse) 2219, (b) pri 1097, voil 2361, puis
2364, fier (: arer, i.e. arere) 2552. Analogical e is added
(a) in the present indicative, (b) the preterite. Examples:
perte, socure 408, pleine 947, mette 1672, somonde 2280, die
2462. Most of these are no doubt invasions by the subjunctive.
(b) descisie 7, entolys 8, s'en fuie 67 and passim at the end of
the verse.

St appears in the present indicative in plest 2363, 3260(: est), and in the present subjunctive in leist (lessor or laier?) 1098, moinst 3164. Possibly also in dist, passim. — this form alternates with dit without any clear indication as to tense, but it seems present at v. 1080:

Li Rois lour dist ke nun ferast:
Bien les servent, mandé les ad.

In conj. I preterites, -ast is preferred to any other ending (contrary to Tanqueray's observation that this is rare, p. 115), as is -ist for i-preterites, but -ust is less common than -ut. The rhyme plest: seet quoted by Tanqueray (p.120) from William of Wadington, end of 13th century, together with the evidence ~~known~~ already given in the sections on Phonetics and Orthography, shows that by now the s in these endings was purely graphical. This is further demonstrated by the extension of ast to the future: durrast 106, peiserast (?) 380, ferast (: ad) 1080, 2405, achiverast 1290, atendrast: defendrast 2073, merrast (: ad) 2462; this tense also has -ad:— serrad: murrad 1355, tendrad 1358; and -at: remaindrat (: ferast) 2404 cf. p~~ro~~haceat (pretente) 1617. -Ast also seems to have invaded the conditional ~~remaindrast~~ in vv. 11-2:

..... suw chief jurast
Ke lour Treud restournerast
Et Wider desheriterast, (Conditionals in Woe)

and in v. 380

.....ja al Roi ne loiereit
Ke Conan del regne heritast,
Car puis apres l'en peiserast

where the future(?) conditional(?) peiserast rhymes with the imperfect subjunctive. Both these examples are probably, however, due to negligence or confusion of tenses: baptiserast occurs at v. 163 where the imperfect subjunctive is required and is correctly written in the next line.

-Ist likewise occurs in many preterites where it is not etymological, e.g. oist, 159, 240 et al., chaist 263 et al., garnist 1370, fenist 1723 vist 184 et al., seist 2723, venquist 3004. Against all these we find forms in -i, -ie, -it, e.g. -oi 165, oie 394 et al., oit 1389 et al.; chai 902, garni 1168, 2072, garnie 1812, feny, finy etc. 2922 et al., finie 2992; vit 1463, 2565, seisi, seiny etc. 2052 et al., seisie 220; venqui 336, 406 et al., venquie 219 etc. etc.

* -Ust appears in a few preterites where it does not belong, e.g. poust 611, dust 761, conust 828, peust (pavit) 795 morust 190, 231 et al., corust 1836, but corut 2574 pout 24, etc. al. There are some examples showing absence of etymological s, as destruit 1620, 2800 and some asigmatic forms where grammar requires the imperfect ~~xxx~~ subjunctive - fu 223, pout 196, 1522 2560, recent (:eust) 2094, envelait written for envoiast 1485. For the preterite of estre, fu is the favorite spelling, but fust is frequent (e.g. 56, 610, 858), and also fud 661 (:eud past part.) 1483. For vouloir, volt is predominant but vousist occurs four times.

* Curiosities in third person endings are, s - s'en

vois 2229, puis 891; z - conustrez (condit.) 1074, fiz (Tanqueray: 652, nâtes fez in Early Stark Statutes of Ireland), 2708; esté (imperf.) 1466, poeit. (present indic.) 1198, cremient (present of craindre - plur. for sing?) 2362.

All the preceding demonstrates effacement of the final consonants or consonantal group. This is registered in the spelling of vin 84, somon 1788.

Change of conjugation is shown in requerast 162, meintena 1941, aconduast 905, movea 3192, plaisist (plaisier) 1254, 1926, menist 757, s'esveillie 2517, enagrotty 3028. All except plaisist are confirmed by the ~~xx~~ rhyme. Plaisist and s'esveillie are examples of the ease with which -ier verbs become -ir verbs.

Imperfect endings of all periods are found, viz. out, oit, eit, but, as already noted, they can rhyme together. The last is by far the commonest. Haiout 1427, destrucout 3220 (guerout), Prenout (chaceout) 3194 seem to show, however, that this ending was still live enough to be acquired by conjugations to which it did not belong.

Abnormal spellings for the radical in this piece are - avint (pres. indic.) 407, (cf. tino etc. above and Tanqueray, p.152), heet (hair) 947, cheet 1304, 2585, chiet 2660, voit (aler or voleir?) 1864, 2396, (aler) 3203, estoet 772, 811 et al. (same form for pret. 265, 321 et al.) doint (pres. subj. doner) 3267, & a common form according to Tanqueray: pp. 314-5. Aider acquires h in hait 1252.

FIRST PERSON PLURAL. There is little to note, as this person

does not often occur. - Oms, -om, ums, -um all appear, e.g. avoms 668 et al, eioms 879, pooms 2342, puoms 596, devoms 911 avom 589, aiom 673, ferom 820, resurdrom 672, poom 2343, occium 822, levom 823, avum 591, perdum 821. Fuums 875 shows estre acquiring a weak form, unless this spelling represents loss of e, with the double u to denote length.

SECOND PERSON PLURAL. The only feature is the omission of e in oiz 2620. The writing of double r in the present - querrez 871, and single r in conditional or future - puriez 597, is not confined to this person.

THIRD PERSON PLURAL. The question of the reduction of the imperfect-conditional ending is the chief subject for remark; there are no examples in this piece of reduction in the present tense. -Eient frequently becomes -eint: fereint 730, purreint 60, 1580 (and five other places, in all of which purreint seems used for the preterite or the imperfect). -Eint then seems to be further reduced to -ent in purrent (apparently conditional) 1521 garirent (cond.) : guerpisent (imperf.) 1094, and a number of others which may only be present ^{forms} ~~verbs~~ mistakenly written for the imperfect. -creient (: estoient) 180, guient (disoient) 519, gueroient: manacent 838, isent (venoient) 1701, vegnent (: attargement) 2190. There are similar examples of apparent conditionals which have acquired the preterite spelling by the change - vengierent: amenerent 846, tollerent (: parloient) 949, elirent (voleint) 1130, destruerent (: gueroient) 1350, cunseillierent (: diroient) 1480, cumbatierent (: diffendient, imperf.) 1541. These are numerous enough to suggest

that -ent was intended as the accented ending of the imperfect and conditional and was not mere careless spelling. In any case the ending seems regarded as a monosyllable.

-Ient seems to be another form assumed by this desinence. Examples: avient(avoir) 484, solient 664, diffendient 1542, cf. supra, coroucient 2295. Cf. poient (pres. indic. pouvoir) 2702. Tanqueray, p. 256, regards this ending as a development peculiar to A-N of the 13th and 14th centuries, affecting chiefly the Present indicative and subjunctive, and rare elsewhere, ~~though~~ though coroucient, and particularly ferient 2755, ought to be preterites rather than any other tense. In the present piece it seems rather a sign of uncertainty over the spelling of the imperfect ending. Cremient, or creiment 2362 (where the 3rd. pers. sing. of craindre is required) may be an example for the present tense. The rhyme ~~xxx~~ vognent: cumbatient 2089 shows apparently the coupling of the two abnormal imperfect indicative endings, though the subjunctive is required.

Gaitoent 1685, escotoent 1231, are the only examples of the etymological imperfect ending for conj. I in this person, but ~~xxx~~ both rhyme in -oient.

-Ierent is a common spelling of the preterite ending of i-preterite verbs, e.g. oierent 555 (fierent), 2422 (respundierent) et al., issierent: espaundierent 2532-3, assailierent 2349, chaierent (durent) 2904. They only rhyme among themselves, however, apart from the first and last examples, and never with -ierent of conj. I. Cf. s'entresailierent: vierent

1323. Like -ier for the infinitive and -ie for the past participle, -ierent is found in many verbs of conj. I to which it did not ~~normally~~ normally belong e.g. acordierent (:herbergierent) 112 (assemblerent) 410, decertierent (:passerent) 562, aportierent (:ariverent) 851, portierent 1598, gardierent 1879, ~~un~~appestierent 1899, cuntierent 2419, chantierent 2955.

Manjuront 1006 shows change of conjugation or influence of the u of the present indicative. Moint^{en}ierent rhymes with amerent 3198.

Pount 2304 is the only example of the ending -unt.
For rhymes showing accented -ent, see p. 169, and
(b) MOODS. cf. p. 115.

1. Indicative. There are numerous examples of the intrusion of the consonne mouillée of the ~~xxx~~ subjunctive, of the ~~xxx~~ use of the subjunctive forms for indicative and vice versa. These phenomena are often no doubt syntactical rather than morphological, e.g. vegnes at v. 2266 may be subjunctive in indirect question, on the Latin model.

Examples: (a) Present tense - preigne 2545, pregnant 1278, preignes, retiegnes 2266, tegnent 3108, vegnes, vegnent 2190(?)
geignent 2434, morgent (:devient) 2901, pleine 947; cf. examples given above of subjunctive forms for indicative in the third pers. sing. (b) Imperfect - vegneient 2248, vegnent(? :attargement) 2190.

The use of the etymologically subjunctive endings for the 3rd. pers. sing. of the preterite has been mentioned already. Conuse 1253, seems an extension of this to the first

person ~~xxxxt~~, and durent (devoir) 928, to the third person plural. Peust (pascere 795, seems an analogical subjunctive form for the preterite, possibly even with hiatus for the metre.

Cf. Versification.

2. Subjunctive. It is not necessary to repeat the examples given of the loss of etymological e in the 3rd. pers. sing of the present subjunctive. Hait (aider) 1252 is written correctly without analogical e; compare emporte: mort cited above. Moins 3164 shows in mener the paragoric s noted particularly in donner by Tanqueray, p. 304. Puis 964, poet 3268 (also at v. 3108 of the Hanover ms., according to Ida Wirtz), court (court?) 785, savez: purrez 886-7, show indicative forms for the subjunctive - again, perhaps, syntactical confusion. This is also common in the imperf. subj. owing, no doubt, to effacement of s before t and the same confusion, e.g. pout 1522, p. 196, fu 223, recut(eust) 2094. Vouloir seems to prefer the s-type radical for the singular (vousist 725, 799), and the form without s for the plural (volisent 2677).

3. Imperative. Imperatives which borrow the form of the subjunctive are face 770, 789, 1488 (fai occurs in the verse preceding both the last two) prenge 776 (pren 778-9) receive 967. Final e of conj. 1 spreads to other conjugations; conuse (i.e. connois) 1247, entende 1650 (cf. entent 1309) cumbate 1729, succure 674.

Z appears at the end of the strong ~~ef~~ forms : ditez 1303 sqq., fetez 741, 1452, 2394. There is the common mixing of singular and plural imperative forms at 2370 sqq.

4. Infinitive. The following are spellings of conj. I infinitives, some of which have already been mentioned:- erré(:sigl6) 1626, repairez(:cunglied) 816, voidé 3200, desirez (plural verbal noun) 1860, nomez(:assez) 2453, edifiers(:chivalers) 448. Cf. Wace's "sun pensé" (L 11323, A 11045). Morir acquires a final e to rhyme with occire at v. 3129; cf. avere 1183.

The irregular termination iar in er verbs, and the rhyming together of these endings, have already been discussed from the point of view of phonetics and orthography, pp. 81 sqq., 90. The spelling affects particularly porter and compounds, garder, ester (2565, 2688), amonester 54, munder 1313. In all these the radical ends in a dental without the preceding i that Suchier's rule required.

Change of conjugation seems to be noted in suffer 320, chaier(:arder, cf. chaierent 2904) 1384, chair 1414, percoir 1413, fruissier(:murir) 1413, meintenir(:chalangier) 2343, (:fier) 3124, meintenir(:encumbrer) 3217, (:cunseiller) 3225, (:justiser) 3195, pleiser(:sigler) 2497, courer 2704.

There is change or confusion of the root vowel in errer(=arare) 1488.

5. Participles (a) Present. There is nothing to note save the spelling demorance (nom. sing., :anz) 2928.

(b) Past. It has already become evident that the final consonant or e-mute of past participles have no particular significance in this piece except where, in the Brut, they happen to be signs of agreement because, no doubt, preserved from earlier scribes. Compare descunfis (fem. sing.) 1979,

descunfit (nom. sing. masc.) 2049 2071, descunfiz (nom. plur. masc.) 1949, descunfitz (acc. plur.) 1560.

Though d occurs at the end of participles in u, its especial prevalence in é participles suggests English influence rather than the remains of th < t.

The question of the ending ié, related to that of ier infinitives and ierent preterites, has already been touched upon (pp. 78, 81 sqq., 90). It seems resumed as far as past participles are concerned by examples such as the following:—
(a) achacié or achatié 589, essacié 130, showing the change é > ié in verbs to which it is not proper in French, (b) exillie: a-vie 3228, showing apparent shift of accent to the i, tantamount to change of conjugation, (c) afeblie: passé 521, lee: en-vaie 527, showing apparently the opposite shift and change. Cf also the spellings haiez 1059, oiez (espies) 612¹³³²,_^: prophecies 1332.

Disregard of syllabic correctness makes it impossible to affirm that syneresis had or had not taken place in the vowel-endings, and there is only the evidence of the spelling. For i past participles, hahi 552, is the only one in which hiatus is definitely indicated. For those in -eu, that of avoir always has e: the rhythm of some verses, e.g. 590, 660, 1054, seems to require two syllables, while in others, e.g. 1954, 2744, one seems more probable. The only exception to correct spelling of eu participles is muz 347 (everywhere e~~se~~ meu or esmeu). Venceud 470, has an improper e, probably by analogy with numerous participles in -ceu. Cf. p. 142.

Of abnormal forms, the ancient ont tolleit appears twice,

2272, 2285 (:dreit), but both cases are found in Wace, and it is probably an archaism by 1340 (cf. Tanqueray, p. 531). Tueiz (:damagiez) 3007, may be one of the spelling in eiz noted by Tanqueray, p. 468, or more probably the noun in -itium. Salu 867, in a non-Wacian passage, seems a form of the author's. It is difficult to decide whether it is from saillir (cf. sailliz 2121) repeating the idea of venu in the previous line, or from saluer - the corresponding passage of Layamon is "they greeted him fair." Airez (:travers) is from ^(or adviser?)aherdre_λ Remes (:nefs) 1071, 2001, is the form of remansus inherited from Wace, while remis (:amis) 775, is in a passage of the author's, this spelling also appearing at 751. At v. 3080 enpoint, spelt enpoint 1577 et al., rhymes with treit. Feru usually has double r:- 2674, 2693, 3078.

Cases of apparent change of conjugation are:- occisés(?) :preised 512, amové:turné (Wace has cāmōné, possibly misread by the scribe) 1038, ~~ex~~tax chaiz 1414, seisez:volez 1454 (cf. infinitives above), departé:finé 1612, exillie:avie 3228, ensepelé, ensevelé, passim in the Chronicle. Apparailliz (:aloignez) 2099 seems absentmindedness.

(c) TENSES

1. Present Indicative There are four forms of the 3rd pers. plur. of pouvoir:- poent 1417, poient 2702, poeint 666, pount 2304.

Destruent 619, 927, shows the absence of s, as well as the common reduction ui > u.

The double r of querrez 871, is not confined to this tense, and is probably due to influence of the future. Cf. below.

2. Imperfect Indicative The vowel of the present stem appear in receiveit 2059. Cf. conditional.

Gn appears in vegneient 2248 on the analogy of the present subjunctive. Perhaps the same influence is in receiveit above.

Conquerreit 2035 curroient 2500 again show improper double r. Cf. syntax.

3. Preterite. The question of syneresis of the stem vowel cannot profitably be taken very far. It seems recognised in the spelling of most verbs originally having dieresis e.g. faire, conquerir, prendre, manoir (remist. 2716) though it may be assumed not to have taken place in oir, cheoir, regehir (regeist 1520 - the e seems to have another rôle than to soften the g) Out and urent, the invariable forms for avoir, seem to decide for that verb.

At v. 2894, vient may be a preterite, or a brusque change of tense from fu : in the preceding verse. A normal form of prendre, pristrent occurs four times, but at v. 2884 occurs Pristent, perhaps only negligence, or perhaps a sign of the weakness of r, or perhaps of the influence of the singular, since -ent was mute. Two interesting spellings of u-preterites occur - destruerent 529, muerent (furent) 2459. They perhaps represent a step in an older stage towards the moverent of the Chronicle (3172) Meintendirent 1415, shows an unusual form of tenir, perhaps due to the influence of the future, or the English tendency to add d to a nasal; or it may be confusion between the older form and that which prevails in French

2462, showing loss of the nasal, and also lerras, 2388, from laier or laisser. On the other hand, puriez, 597, shows an *y* too few.

Tenir and venir invariably show the O.F. stems tend-, vend-. Receivereient 844, seems to show formation on recevoir with svarabhaktic *e*, but cunquerrereit 2022, seems quite barbarous. Orras 1283, is the future of oir, but the same form in the next line seems careless repetition - Wace has saras (sa - Voir) for the first.

Inchoative verbs invariably show the intertonic *i* becoming *e*, e.g. guerperreit 364, regeherai 1256, finereit 1338. Freit 2181, is the only example of loss of *e* in spelling. Tollir has the two forms tollerunt 951 and touldrai 2289. Occiereit 1450 2091, 2526, may be a case of the *ier* spelling already noted in -irent preterites, or perhaps denotes a glide-vowel developing between *i* and *y*. Destruereit 1994, seems a similar case. Liverai 682, 2293, seems the future of *e* livrer.

Svarabhaktic [^] is very prevalent in these tenses, e.g. iisterai 1857, cumbaterai 2550, cumbatereit 416, deveireit 3126 avoir passim.

Conjugation Changes.

Apart from sporadic examples like menist, requerast, manjurent, s'esveillie, esparnisent, acconduast, quoted above, and the frequent rhymes in *é* : *ie* : *i*, erent : ^{ierent} _^ irent; er; ier; ir; ire, a few cases of change seem well established: maintenir, seisir and m^oveir give several instances of movement into conj. I. Finir, which has finast, finé, finereit, had of course made this move in O.F.

D. SYNTAX.

The chief deviations from O.F. usage calling for notice are in the use of verbs, though there is also confusion in other parts of speech, and some unusual constructions. Many peculiarities of all kinds seem to be due to the influence of English.

Use of Nouns. The use of apposition with partitive or possessive sense is perhaps more emphatic than in Wace, e.g. the change from that author's "Et a Hengist fist Kent avoir," to "Et Hengist prist Kent aveir" (1051); also "la feille Charlemein", 2931, "le fiz Roi Phelippe de France" 3162, "cristienté lei," 2874, "al entrant esté" 122 (Wace: "d'esté").

Gender. Numerous examples of the haphazard use of masculine and feminine articles were given in the section on declension. They do not necessarily mean change of gender in their nouns - la Roi, la Pape obviously do not. Nouns like besoigne, (i.e. besoin) tense, however, appear to show real formation of feminine words on the masculine models, e.g. icele tense 640, ta besoigne 2383 - the latter is perhaps the French feminine word used as its masculine prototype, though the substitution occurs everywhere.

Use of Pronouns. The ms shows everywhere the usual A-N. employment of tonic for atonic forms of the personal pronouns.

Li (acc.) is used for the reflexive pronoun at v. 1172; apparently also le at v. 1670. On the other hand, sei is used for lor at v. 1542, and se for le at v. 1688. These may be Latinisms as both pronouns occur in indirect commands and refer to the subject of the principle clause.

Tu and vous, with the corresponding verbs, are as usual very mixed. See particularly the speeches of Hoel 2369-2389, and

Angusel 2394.1st.

Adjectives. The singular form of adjectives is often used with plural nouns, particularly grant, e.g. grant demoinos 186, grant avers 422, grant honurs 3038; also, sun home devindrent 1899. This is no doubt due to the non-declension of English adjectives.

The non-accord of participles, even in adjectival use, has already been noticed. Most cases of correct accord are no doubt due to the model text, though the Chronicle has occasional examples. The adverb primes has become an adjective at vv. 1020 (promises in Wace), 3103; it may, however, be primers, from which *v* has fallen, or a borrowing of the Latin *primus*. The word seems to have remained in English.

Articles. It has already been suggested (p. 109) that confusion in enclitic forms of the article with preposition may be syntactical rather than morphological. To the examples given may be added:

Ke des Daneis de de Norreis	574
Jeo su neez des hois et de cuntes	1227
Des paiens et de gent adverse	2793
As povres abbeies et a hospitals	3045

These seem to show regular usage of the preposition alone before the second noun - perhaps some notion of the scribe's or due to the effacement of *S*. The preposition *de* is similarly used for the partitive *des* before *leur* at vv. 95, 564.

Prepositions. The correct use of prepositions being one of the most difficult parts of an acquired language, it is natural for a late Anglo-Norman writer to show uncertainty. The present scribe does not always keep to the usages of his model, putting *pur* (*chiereté*) for *par* 283, though Wace also has *pur joie*, *pur amistié* as Egerton at v. 1029. Cf. *perjeue* for *porjeue* 1278,

apartenanz for apartenanz 955. Od is used for as or a at v. 1694: Un esteille...od plusurs gentz est veue. Cf. od un gaine, 3079, 3142. A is omitted at v. 2895: "Bien passez treis jours chivalcher"; and possibly v. 1190: "Pere et mortier aloer." Perhaps v. 1051 should be "Prist Kent a aveir."

Conjunctions. Que gives the scribe some trouble. He omits it in "pur coe quant" (= "for that when"?) for "pur ce que quant" at v. 231. On the other hand he uses the conjunction desi Ke for the preposition desi at vv. 620, 2115. Ke = during which at v. 3202. Si appears to be written for sin at v. 1248 (Wace has si non). The construction of vv. 1864-5 appears very complicated and un-Gallic:

A savoir li Rois volt coment
Si li Quiens esteit ocis
Et li chastel par force cunquis.

Verbs. Mixed tenses. Beside the use of imperfect for preterite common in A-N (no doubt because English had only one simple past tense), e.g. vv. 1142B, 1694, 2225, there is the converse use of preterite for imperfect, e.g. in vv. 2986, -90.

The conditional also is often used for the imperfect, particularly with pouvoir and vouloir, no doubt because of the English analytical imperfect with would, e.g. vv. 1118, 1260, 1509, 1604, 2825, 3125-6. Conversely, the imperfect seems written for the conditional at vv. 1147, 1183 (or subjunctive?) 1204. The use of the (apparently) conditional of pouvoir for the preterite at vv. 60, 2332, 2532, 2688-9, 2826, may be due to the writing of purreint for purrent, though there is once purreient, and the combination of double r and eint or eient so often does not seem mere accidental spelling. Perhaps the conditional, having come to be looked upon as an imperfect, could then interchange with the preterite.

The future appears to be used for the conditional at vv. 11-12, 245-6, 380, 2073-4 (as Wace.)

Confusion of Moods. The indicative is often used where the subjunctive is required, e.g. v. 163 (baptiserast for baptisast), 166 (pout for poust), 485 (envoioit for onveiaast), 886, 964, 1183, 1522, 1572 2180-1, 3268. On the other hand the subjunctive, in form at least, is often used for the indicative, e.g. 610-1, 658, 673 (after si). Cf Morphology (Conjugation).

The author shows ingenuity in avoiding redoutable subjunctives. Wace (Arnold's text 14661-2, 14665-6) has:

En sun tens fud falte de blé,
E do la falte tint chierté....
Bien peussiez treis jorz orrer
Ne trovissiez a achator.

The Egerton ms has:

En sun temps fu falt de blee
Et de la falt vient chierté;
Bien passez treis jours chivalcher,
N'i troverez qe achater (2892-5)

Non-accord of subject and verb. There are numerous examples of (a) singular verbs with plural subjects, e.g. li Dragon (pl.) signifiout .. s'assemblout (if this is a case of the ending ont, it is the only one in the piece) 1329-30, aveit for aveient 2055, cremeit for cremeient 1401, les Bretuns l'amast 269, ils solt/1551, les barones corona 2892, les barons ama 2915, fu dolent si amye 2968, ses barons l'ensepelist .. grant doel en fist 3133, les barons iceo vist 3234. Most of these are confirmed by rhyme. (b) Plural verbs with singular subjects, e.g. l'autre partie .. ne poeint 66, Igerne .. les saluerent (Nentrerent) 1837, Edward ... bien les meintenerent (:amerent) 3198, Li Roi ... prendre les fist s'ils encroierent (:chivalchierent) 3240. It is noticeable that most examples are in the chronicle; the passage about Igerne also seems largely the scribe's handiwork.

Verbs conjugated with être. Many verbs were of course conjugated with être in O.F. which now have avoir. Numerous apparently unusual examples in this piece are in Wace also, e.g. li feus est en le chastel pris 1380, croître 892. In original passages verbs so conjugated are chivalcher 1892, 1904, faillir 2912. At v. 1425 venir is conjugated with avoir, as often in O.F.

Reflexive Verbs Numerous reflexive verbs lose their reflexive pronouns and thus change into ordinary intransitive verbs, no doubt through English influence. Examples: s'apparailer 116, se pleindre 278, se haster 865, s'achever 1290, s'aherdre 1575, se lever 2640, s'arester 2643, s'en aler 3191. There is no case of conjugation with avoir.

Intransitive verbs with accusative. Use of the direct object pronoun with verbs requiring the indirect is common, no doubt again through the influence of English usage, e.g. envoyer 568, promettre 922, 1915, tramettre 1096, cuntredire 1158, repundre 1237, cunter 2861.

Various constructions. Ne is omitted at vv. 103, 1074, 1230, 2552 - again a probable Anglicism.

"Avoir a nom" (3035, 3157) is peculiar to A-N. Gaimar uses it apparently to fill out the verse, but it may have some connection with the Middle English to-name, surname.

"Ou devenir," used twice 1197, 2810, where Wace has que devenir," is difficult to explain unless the author was thinking of venir rather than devenir. Cf. v. 180: "Ou li home paynym creient," where Wace again has que.

The inversion caused by inserting "il" in v. 100 is unnecessary. Cf. the ambiguity caused by inversion at v. 2849: Cil ad Seint Austin baptisez.

Anglicisms. There are a number of what appear to be Anglicisms, beside those already indicated. Envoyer pur, 1062-3, which Miss Pope picked out as an Anglicism in the Black Prince

is not one, as the expression occurs in the corresponding lines of Wace, in Le Roux de Lincy's continental text 7217-8. Mander pur is likewise common to both (E 1115, L 7371), but at v. 533 the Egerton ms has mander pur where Wace has *envoyer à*.

"Par nuit" 965, seems to render "by night," and "unt pris l'our cuné," 606, "have taken their leave." "Tenir od" vv. 1089-90, seems to be "hold with," i.e. support, while "cunseiller od," 1044-5, equals "counsel with." "En decline" at v. 1672 seems to be English, as also "esteit tenuz beals," 3046, and "qi d'els" (which of them) 2091, and "li uns qi se eschapièrent" (the ones who escaped) 507. "L'autre partie ... ne point," 65-6, seems an English usage, as does the non-repetition of prepositions before nouns at vv. 601, 616, among others, and of adjectives at v. 1758, with the omission of *que* at vv. 231, 875. Other probable Anglicisms are: *grantez à moi* 968; *un clerc des lettres mult sachant* (Knowing much of letters?) - the change from Wace's adjective "savant" seems significant) 1266; *a greniours choses attendeit* (Attend to? Wace has *entendoit*) 304; *se il le volt mettre en sa meine* (place it in his hands? W. has "s'il se voloit") 1670. V. 1676 "Es meins ceo mist a cel felun," seems to show that the *le* of v. 1670 was no mere clerical error, though *ceo* may of course represent the reflexive pronoun.

(E) VOCABULARY.

The vocabulary is of course largely Wace's but the author's own poverty in this respect is evident in the Chronicle. There are, ~~however~~ however, a number of interesting forms and meanings, some of which do not seem to appear elsewhere. A number of Romance words are seen at the interesting point of becoming English ones with modification of meaning and form, while a few English words are adapted to French forms.

In the Glossary will be found the principal forms and meanings not in the dictionaries like those of Godefroy and Tobler. Many of these, like *acomuner*, *deservir*, *surverse*, are Wace's, and a number of words ~~like~~ which do appear in the dictionaries are exemplified chiefly from that author, e.g. *carole*, *cenroi*, *deglageiz*, *enloguné*. Others again, though not appearing in dictionaries, seem to be slightly-changed forms of Wace's words perhaps illustrating their actual development in Anglo-Norman, or being merely the scribe's approximations e.g. *efforcement* (544) or being merely the scribe's approximations e.g. *efforcement* (544) for Wace's ^{enforcement} *enceinement* (1803) for *cenement*, *s'entre apaier*^{ent} (2834) for *se rapaierent*. There are a number of coined words like *aconduer* (= *amener*) 905, *aplaner* (= *aplanoier*) 630, *departiement* (= *depar*) 615. A few cases seem to call for special mention.

Aforce 1977-8, 1735, *afforce* 212, *eforce* 476, 1631(?), seem to be forms taken, (owing to phonetic changes of *e* > *a*, *z* > *s*?) by the word *efforz* 1178, with the sense of army. The fact that it occurs at the end of two consecutive verses (1977-8) suggests that

in the first it had this meaning, in the second the sense of "effort."

Avie, subject of surdre 3221, object of avoir 3227, existed in English up to the 17th century in the adverbial form a-vie, no doubt an unconscious re-creation of the original word after apheresis had given vie: the latter is still found meaning "contest" or "challenge" in Holland's Plutarch. The probable origin is envie, anvie, which by denasalisation and obscuring of the pretonic syllable might give this form; the adverbial expression à (en)vie probably had an influence, just as à force may have helped to make aforce.

Cremeiseit (ms reading) 1133. Wace has:

Ki se criensist de traitor?

while Eg. reads: Ke^r se cremeiseit de treisoun?. Whether by mistake or deliberately, the scribe appears to have changed craindre to cramoiser, with the sense of to stain. Or he may have intended cremeilleit (cf. cremeilleux = craintif).

Forcelette 450, so written, does not seem to appear elsewhere, though the form may be due to similarity of o and t. Forceret, however, appears in a letter of Edward III, 1357.

Gaine, gaigne 3080, 3143, has already been discussed (p. 38).

Lentin 2531 (:matin) appears to be a formation for the sake of rhyme, perhaps a misreading of Wace's "Costentin." The forms given in Godefroy are lentif, lentiu (rhyming in -iu).

Mure (?) 895, v. p. 39.

A number of verbs have different construction or meaning, or both, from those in O.F. S'afier 306, which normally meant "to pledge oneself," "place one's confidence," seems here to have the absolute meaning "be confident." (Wace's "s'i fia" is changed to "s'afioit"). Aprismer 279, with the preposition de, has the meaning of se préparer, unless it is a mistake for "aprismer à," i.e. consentir à. Venger 2397, (object li) had in O.F. the sense of se venger de, as here, but there seem no examples of its use with a personal direct object denoting the person on whom vengeance is taken.

Some note has already been made, (v. Orthography, Syntax) of the large number of masculine words showing a "feminine" form, sometimes even qualified by a feminine article or adjective. Some, like moigne 713, bosoigne passim, were common on the continent, though the feminine doublet often had a different meaning, as in the case of besoiing, besoigne. (Both these senses are spelt bosoigne in this text). Typical in it are aforce, Romance: Bretance 986, 1507, decesse 2872, decline 1672, gaigne 2044, juvencele 1770. nece, 399, 2776, poice 1671, poigne 1786, recette 970, tense 640, funce 1320, reinge 2103, 2666. Cf ~~mat~~ croice 291 (Croce in W.), peese 2871. The fact that many of these forms have remained in English attests to their reality. Cf masculine adjectives like terce 286, eloquence 641, etc.

Other words which have taken almost their English form
or meaning

are mene (second, still so used in the west of England in the 19th century) 286; ioi, joy 1029, 2213; deviser (bequeath) 3052; baillif (if lost in O.F. remained in England, showing early borrowing) 302; periller (be in peril) 502; remuer (remove) 233; puer (large number, particularly a west of England use) 771; enfranchir (bestow, endow with - examples of this meaning in Godefroy are from A.N. mss) 3116; citizein 2144, ordeinant 2854.

Apart from actual Anglo-Saxon or English expressions like "Nume ure sexes," "Rome peny", English words are few. Ain 1995 still represents the Scottish form of "own"; it was apparently current in law French, as it appears in Kelham. Tide 2491, is in Arnold's text of Wace, from the A.N. Penrose ms, but not in Le Roux de Lincy's Northern ^{French one.} Wace may have used it, as he shows in this passage a nautical vocabulary more Germanic than French. Tide appears in Godefroy, but all the examples are from English mss. Estorne 2495, not in Wace, is evidently the Middle English steorn (helm) now stern.

To resume, this ms is not without importance as a linguistic document. It has a few characteristics which seem to differentiate it from most of its contemporaries, like the predominance of -ast in the preterite or the question of the diphthong ou digraph ie running through its phonology, orthography and morphology. But it is above all interesting, not as an isolated specimen, but as an almost final stage in the evolution, in rather less than two centuries, of Wace's "pure Norman." We are enabled to see what has en-

dured, and on the other hand the changes developed in that time, or deemed necessary by a scribe of 1340 to make Wace's language, as well as his story, acceptable to speakers of French in England.

VI VERSIFICATION

A. METRE AND SCANSION

In the Egerton Brut we have the interesting combination of some 2,900 lines based upon an older work, with 354 composed to all appearances in the middle of the 14th century.

The Brut as Wace wrote it was correct by continental standards of versification. Though, as we have seen, there are reasons in Layamon's version, in the various Mss & in the present abridgment, for supposing that there existed a later and probably insular version or versions different from that embodied in the Le Roux de Lincy's edition, the prosody of these seems to have been fairly regular also. The Ms Cotton Vitellius A X, for example, dating from about 1240, is distinctly Anglo-Norman in language and orthography, but less irregular from the Metrical point of view than the present Ms.

Of the latter it can be said in a general way that the versification is more "correct", apart from occasional startling "lapses", in the part based upon Wace than in the section which appears to be wholly original. Irregularities in the first part occur especially in passages apparently peculiar to our author, or in which he summarises longer passages of his model.

The basic metre of the piece is thus the octosyllable rhymed couplet in which Wace originally wrote, that is to say, the author seemed to intend his lines to have, in Vising's formula, about eight syllables, and to rhyme in pairs

In estimating the "correctness" or otherwise of the versification, or in attempting to find method in the apparent

metrical madness, we are brought against the problem of atonic e, the point on which French versification in England first began to deviate from the continental. Before its early demise, Anglo-Norman appears to have travelled with precocious speed along lines which continental spoken French has since followed, to have lost in pronunciation many atonic syllables, and brought about syneresis in many words which formerly had vowels in hiatus. There seem to be many cases in the present text where atonic syllables do not count for the author, and probably as many others where they count if the lines are to scan. Further, although final atonic e usually seems to require elision before a vowel, there are a number of lines which are only "correct" if hiatus is kept. Finally there seems great uncertainty on the value of words with internal hiatus.

We can hardly argue, as has often been done, our scribe's ignorance of French versification, since he was working from an older model, though, as suggested, not necessarily as correct as Wace's original. There is every evidence that he considered his system normal and that he was not learning versification as he went, as Vising supposes of the author of the Life of Pope Clement; the proportion of "correct" lines is in fact greater near the beginning of the fragment, and is smallest in the final portion. Vising has pointed out that the copyists often leave us in the same Ms a good copy of a French poem with an Anglo-Norman one in "bad" verse.

In many cases in this Ms, e is an inorganic or perhaps ornamental letter. On the other hand it has been omitted often where we should expect one. These cases will be discussed later

but for the purposes of a preliminary assessment of the versification the scribe's addition or omission of e has been respected, and continental rules applied except in the following cases (a) about forty lines, (mostly in the part based upon the Brut) containing eight syllables plus one or more svarabhaktic e's have been counted correct, e. g. vv. 74 (with "severast"), 118 (devoreit) 307 (deliverast), 416 (cumbatereit). Though modern English "delivor, sever," etc. seem to make it probable, we can hardly decide whether this e yet had syllabic value in Anglo-Norman. There are at least six lines, however, (1487, 1521, 1553, 1720, 3132, 3256), where counting a svarabhaktic e would make them octosyllabic.

(b) Another forty-odd lines, again mostly in the Brut, containing nine syllables as written, but having an elidable ^{vowel} ^, have also been counted correct (e.g. vv. 1041, 1050, 1267, 1290) (c) So (e.g. vv. 102, 129, 160, 766,) have also over 100 lines (92 in the Brut) in which the final atonic e is in hiatus, but which are octosyllabic if scanned without elision, as Gaimar apparently intended the line quoted by Vising (Anglo-Norman Language and Literature, p. 84): Si firent rei de Edelfriz.

This is by no means peculiar to Anglo-Norman, however. Wace has numerous lines like: Por demandor que il feroit (ed. L. 5154) which our author perversely cuts short by writing "q'ill".

If he be thus pardoned about one hundred and ninety verses, we find in the whole piece nearly a thousand, or over 30%, containing, as written, more or less than eight syllables. Of these, 822 are in the part based upon the Brut (2,914 lines) giving a percentage in this part of just over 28%, of "incorrect" verses, while the number in the last part (174 out of 354) represents

almost half, that is, the proportion which Ida Wirtz found in the Hanover Ms.

These facts alone seem to make it clear that in the first part our author was "disciplined" by an older and more "correct" poem. Having studied and abridged this piece of over 15,000 lines he is hardly in the position of Vising's learner, even if this were a first effort. In actual fact, his proficiency in French and French versification apparently suffers alarming and progressive decline the further he continues. Long passages near the beginning of the fragment are "correct", or almost so; independence of his model, both in matter and versification, grows as he progresses, till the final and apparently original section shows complete breakdown of French rules. The first two lines of this part:

Egbrid sun fiz enpres regna,
Les barons de la terre mult l'ama,

give the keynote of what is to follow: Pegasus has broken his traces and galloped for freedom, which proves, it is true, rather a pedestrian state.

The great majority of the irregular lines have seven or nine lines as written. There are only 41 lines having less than seven syllables, and twenty with eleven or more. Of about 110 decasyllables, more than half contain one or two atonic e's. We thus have 350 verses containing, to judge strictly from the written text, seven syllables, and 478 nonasyllables. Of the latter 338 contain one or more atonic e's, and in about 100 of these the atonic syllable occurs at the fifth. Sixty-two of the seven-syllable lines end in atonic syllables, but as these line rarely occur in pairs (though c.f. vv. 173-4, 318-9, 507-8 etc), they

can hardly be intended as a regular type of verse requiring the final syllable to be counted as the eighth, as Vising believes of Brendan and some other pieces. Indeed, a nine-syllable line commonly precedes or follows a seven-syllable one (c.f. vv. 113-4 255-6, 1050-1, 1114-5, etc.), which may satisfy the author that his tale of syllables is complete in two lines if not in one.

There are palliating, or at least explanatory circumstances for many of the syllabically irregular lines. In his work of a-bridgment the author very often, for the sake of clearness, substitutes polysyllabic nouns for pronouns or other short words. Suchier noticed this care for clearness outweighing metrical considerations in Anglo-Norman poets. Thus in the very first line Kenbelin replaces Wace's Cist and gives the line two extra syllables. In v. 489 meschines is substituted for en; Wace had mentioned the maidens previously, but our author had not. Similarly Bretuns has to come into v. 533; Wace has (v. 5248, ed.L; 6109, ed. A) -"Mandé ont a Maximian," with the Bretuns as subject, but the omission of a long passage in our version leaves the invaders as subject of the verb unless "Bretuns" be inserted. Li Reis for il is a common substitution of this kind, e.g. v. 661:

Puis que li Rois Maximian fu

for Wace's Puis que cil Maximain fu.

C.f. also vv. 870, 1046, 1088, 1855, etc. Lines 692, 1036, 1084 1100, 1455, among many others, owe their irregularity to the substitution of proper nouns for Pronouns.

Definite changes which he introduces into Wace's lines also

cause irregularity. The alteration of

Par lui regut cristienté
Engleterre premierement (Wace, ed. L, 5335)

into Par lui creut Saint Cristienté
En Engleterre primerement (Eg. 156)

is a fair example of his methods and its results. Another is the

compression of As Yglises dona francise
Et de ses teres les fieva
Et grant maisnie lor dona (Wace, L. 5381)

into Saint Eglise de ces terres feofast
Et grant demeines lour donast. (Eg. 185)

Then we have insertion, omission or alteration of unimportant words like et, en, noted by Miss Pope as a disturbing factor in the Black Prince. Examples: Sovent tourner, sovent joindre (et sovent in W. Eg. 52)

De sun chival Hamon discendoit (71. Del in W.)
En pees regnast et en pees feny. (188. Et not in W)
Et en Bretaine les envoierent:
Et un senatour Sever (200-1. En Bretaine, un lor senator, in W.)

Other examples are found in vv. 1659, 2104, etc.etc.

A similar cause of irregularity is "modernisation" of words particularly proper nouns, and a tendency to restore etymological forms. Thus the author throughout prefers Pictiens to Pis and at v. 1019 Bretun to Brez, a sign that his feeling for declension is as weak as that for syllabic regularity: further examples are Lorenge for Loheraigne, (453, 2157,) verité for verté (1868), arrelsonez for araisné (941), sudeinement for sodement (499) pluose for pluose (496), face for fai (770) and d'amparz for de totes parts (624), des deus pars (2098). Customary formulae perhaps creep in in de par bref for par bref (1788) (cf. de par la terre, 1501) and Rei et Seignur for Signor (1368). Line 857 is upset by one of the author's few blunders: he has the relative

142

qe i. (qi) in the previous line, but repeats himself with qi at the beginning of this line. We have noted that Wace carefully avoids naming Uther's victim, Count Gorlois of Cornwall: our author has no such scruple, and the insertion of the name in lines based upon Wace usually upsets the tale of syllables.

Many words containing vowels in hiatus in Wace had almost certainly undergone syneresis in England by this time, judging by loan-words like realm, ransom, treason, gain, chain. In this text if we are to count syllables, there seems to be hesitation. Of the lines containing seur or its compounds, all except one (v1203) (scan "correctly" if it is counted as dissyllabic, (e.g. vv. 345, 350, 473). Similarly the e in eu past participles seems to have syllabic value (e.g. vv. 348, 944, 73, 739), though a few verses count nine syllables if this e is given value (e.g. 945, 1873). Line 347 has the past participle of mover without e, and counts only seven syllables. The above and other examples of apparent dieresis may be simply orthographical conservatism due to the influence of the original, while muz slips in to show the usual pronunciation, (cf. meuz, 1343). The subjunctives in ei (entremeisent, 343; deist 798; preist, 1151, 1205; feist, 2014; veisses, passim) seem to ~~keep hiatus~~ (but cf. occist, 1205) while many of those in eu seem to have lost it in spelling as well as pronunciation, e.g. pust, 340, 693; avoir seems to keep it, as: eust, 2093; eussent, 2857. Tanqueray, in his edition of Plaintes de la Vierge, notes the difficulty of drawing any conclusions from the spelling of these past participles and subjunctives.

The majority of the twenty-one lines containing troud are

"correct" if it is dissyllabic, though five seem to have nine syllables: the spelling tru2 leaves v. 2267 with eight syllables. Reine twice rhymes with ine (141, 1957) which might indicate that it is still dissyllabic, but in that case five of the seven lines in which it occurs have nine ^{or more} syllables. ~~respectively in the four verses where it occurs.~~ We may note that if the word has no dieresis in v. 2214 (Devant la Reine Conovro aloront) the verse becomes one of the class of monosyllables with an atonic at the fifth. Leil (logalen, v. 386) rhymes with cunseil and the verse has eight syllables if it is a monosyllable, Prechoient has lost (v 173) the second o which it had in Waco, like cuntrés in the next line; both are left with only seven syllables. The word spelt creantor in L's text, graanter in A's, is here spelt graunter three times (vv. 109, 764, 976) granter twice (968, 1043). In w. 109, 976 three syllables seem to be required, in the other two. Auner (413 etc.) seems to keep dieresis. The words in our or our also show uncertainty: esperour occurs ten times and in eight at least seems to count four syllables; dovinour, quoreour (1280, 1307, 1213) also seem to count the e. If parlour has only the two syllables with which it passed into English, v. 749 has only seven syllables; on the other hand mentour (1295) and conquerour (3261) seem to need only two and three syllables respectively. If dieresis is kept in meimes, v. 692 has eleven syllables, and v. 2488 eight; the spelling meimes gives 2340 only seven. Lines 1464, 1466, 1474, containing cheine, seem altogether too doubtful for any conclusion to be drawn on its value; the same is true of the half-a-dozen lines containing gaigne or raigner. Miss Pope thought that these words had no

hiatus in the Black Prince. In both these last two cases the spelling here and the English form makes it practically certain that syneresis had taken place. If rauncean is dissyllabic only, as in Aspromont, (v. 6404) v. 1171 is a perfect octosyllabic; the word was trissyllabic in Wace. In vv. 723, 762, 1690, traitre seems to need three syllables, but in 832, 3009, only two; in fact touz, not found in Wace's corresponding line, ^{insertion} has been inserted in line 832 as if to fill it out. A similar ^{of} les is found in v. 1295 containing mentour, noted above. Treisun is thrice spelt thus (1126, 1133, 1675); if it is trissyllabic, the last two verses have too many syllables. On the other hand, tresun in vv. 1911, 3013, only gives seven syllables in the verse. The treatment of realme, which occurs nine times, in the last part only, is uncertain if we are working on a syllabic basis, though the rhyme regne; realme (3051), John Trevisa's reem and the modern pronunciation seem to indicate a monosyllable. Mone (moyen, v. 286 is obviously one, and plentive (385) has been reduced by a syllable. In the proper names Johan, if dissyllabic, gives ten, eleven, seven and nine syllables respectively in the four verses where it occurs. Edward, considered by Miss Pope to count three syllables in the Black Prince here seems to count only two; this would give seven syllables in vv. 2971, 3041, but eight in vv. 3055, 3065, 3190, 3209, 3261. Austin, which seems to count three syllables in Gaimar, apparently requires that number in v. 2841, but only two in v. 2849. Gloucestre seems invariably four syllables as in Wace, though Le Roux de Lincy did not always notice this (cf. vv. 5206, 7443, 12722 of his edition).

Enclisis is often indicated by the spelling (e.g. 3ks, nes

145

sad, nel); . . . many lines would be improved from the syllabic viewpoint if enclisis, as in Wace's text, were substituted for the full spelling given in Egerton, e.g. vv. 169, 219, 339, 812, 985, 1380, 2695,

More than any of the above, however, the chief cause of the poem's syllabic uncouthness, which it shares with contemporaries and predecessors, is the ubiquitous yet elusive letter e. As Ida Wirtz noticed in the Hanover ms we find it tacked on to many words, chiefly masculines, where it has no right in grammar, etymology or logic, and absent from many others to which it belongs by these same tokens, Line 1701:

De cele Dragon deus Raies venoient

is typical in this respect. With few exceptions, and those usually feminine, the word now tout is spelt tote, (e.g. vv. 8, 791, 1953, 1274, etc.), plural toted (82, 2865, 3018, etc.). "Totes ses barons" is a favourite cliché. Bone, bele, are as a rule masculine (1648, 2135, etc.), the feminine of the latter being generally beal, (1958-124, etc.), Meinte is generally masculine (e.g. 1648, 2135), as are petite (46, 261), ceste (821), merveilleuse (1707, 1774), veire (330), etc.etc.. Tel, qel acquire an analogical e, in one case in the masculine (v. 730). Many, too, are the nouns with a caudal e: champe, cunseile, (passim) nefe (72 etc.), mere (mor 323 etc.), hanape (1030), engine (1184 etc.) coupe (221), mure (879 etc.), chastele (1846 etc.), cuire (873, 980) langure (3257) honure 3254, Romeine (320, 582). Adverbs also acquire e: demeine (1361, 1730) trope (889) entoure (973), as do also imperatives of the third conjugation: entende (1650) cumbate (1729), and a third person singular: somonde (2280). We have also forms like Escose (Escos, passim) nece (nies, 399 etc.) trestourne (trestour, 41), dedeigne

(dédain, 1900) bosoigne (passim). In all these, and many other cases, the final e gives the line apparently nine syllables.

The converse happens in many feminine and other words having a right to atonic e. un appears for une almost everywhere, tōt for tote (1979, 3017, etc.), maint for mainte (584) nul for nule (2163), mis (mises, 491), icel (icelo, 2953), joī (706), joy (2004), veī (veio, 121) pier (pere, passim), gent et beal (gonte et belo, 124), dreit (dreite, 268) Engleter, (445) Irland (1969) cum (1663 and passim). These forms appear to leave the line with only seven syllables, yet in others the syncopation leaves the line with eight syllables as flot (flote, 2798), un lance (2693), un maladie (3186). Numerals like unze, quinze, very rarely written in full, seem to lose their final e in vv. 489, 573, 1497, 2321 etc., while they appear to require it in vv. 447, 1540, 2479 etc. Trente always seems to require its e (cf. vv. 2983, 3109). There are also a number of adverbs or nouns in -ment showing the spelling ee as bonneement (99), defineement (146), primereement (753), where this ee only seems to count one syllable. Yet counting priveement as four syllables only gives seven to the whole line 341 (note spelling priveement in v. 2843), and primereevement should only count three to be "correct". Sire, written Sir or Syr in the Chronicle, seems to need sometimes one syllable, sometimes two, the latter especially in places where it is spelt without e; ore could apparently do without e in the majority of cases, as has been noticed of the same word in Thomas' Tristan. Similarly soventefois (3219, 3194 etc.) seems usually to need only three syllables, and forement (1322, 1706), ambedeus (255, 1244) only two. In a number of lines (e.g. 56, 112, 169, 255 etc.) the

verbal ending -ent seems not to count, as Meyer noticed in Frere Angier. Perhaps, as in Musset and other moderns, the scanning of this syllable was optional. Perhaps even lines like 870: "De quelle terre dit le Roi, venez?" anticipate Verlaine and others in "po-tache" mood: "De quel' ter', dit le Roi, venez?" (cf. 185). The occurrence of an extra atonic syllable at the fifth in about 100 lines suggests that such a syllable did not count in Anglo-Norman verse. The number of such lines would be increased if doomsyllabics were added which contain an atonic fifth syllable and perhaps another in the remaining part of the verse (e.g. 499, 381, 870, 1866). We also have examples appearing to indicate effort to fill out the measure by the introduction of irrational letters which require to be pronounced, to replace loss elsewhere, as:

En un nef e entrer voleit	(72)
Ni ad uns Romeine lessez	(357)
Mult le tint pur bone devin	(1336)
Un fort cheine de fere tint	(1458)
Et cele loos li vint a gré	(2427)
Les barones l'en corona	(2892)

Similar effort to effect reparation for losses real or felt seems to show itself in:

Ke la malvais gent ont venu	(700 W. has no conjunction but his adjective agrees)
Grant puer i ad des traitours	(771 W. Grant paor ai de t.
Les traitres fist touz decoler	(832 W. does not need touz
Et jeo meismes od tel irrai	(2398 W. has no conjunction
Et l'Empereour q' i te defie	(2377, same remark)
Mult parlez resonablement	(2370 L: parolés avenamment. A: parolés raisnablement).

Pur mentours les feral tenir (1295. W: menteors feral)

Tanqueray has noticed how, owing to phonetic changes, Anglo-Norman writers seem to count or ignore mute syllables at will :

" leur traitement des muettes leur a fait très tôt perdre le sens même de ce qu'est un vers français. Leur façon de prononcer le

français rendait incorrect les neuf dixièmes des vers français corrects qu'il leur arrivait de lire, car tous les vers qu'ils avaient sous les yeux semblaient avoir un nombre de syllabes extrêmement variable, suivant le nombre d'e atones qu'ils avaient et que les Anglo-Français comptaient ou ne comptaient pas. Il en résulta qu'après un temps ils oublièrent et ne purent plus reconnaître que le principe du vers français, c'est le nombre fixe de syllabes." (Evolution p.783). The foregoing paragraphs have amply borne out these remarks.

Perhaps, however, discussion of this piece, and others like it, from the syllabic point of view is beside the mark. The chief feeling which emerges from the foregoing is that it is hopeless to seek to apply the French principles of versification. Are we to attribute this apparent chaos merely to the decline of French in England and the ignorance of Anglo-Norman poets, as has been generally done so far? Or were these poets in reality applying other methods instead of, or in addition to, the remains of the French system?

Vising (op. cit. p. 81) says: "The Anglo-Norman poets were in general, even if they belonged to the clergy, people of little learning, and what they possessed least of all was system and theory. Most of them did not know English, or knew it only imperfectly, and at the same time they found no little difficulty, as they themselves admit, in handling the French language and French versification. How was it possible for them to construct out of two metrical systems they hardly knew a now and very complicated system?"

Most of this could be contested in detail. The vast didac-

149

didactic literature they have left, including the earliest known attempts at grammars of French, hardly convicts the Anglo-Normans of ignorance or lack of system greater than they shared with their contemporaries in other countries. Even the most learned of them, like Archbishop Peckham, who had been a professor at the University of Paris, persists in writing French very little different from that of less distinguished compatriots who might be considered more ignorant. The incompetence which they admit was no doubt in French versification as understood on the continent, not necessarily in their own system; it is still the prerogative of the English to persist in the ignorant practices for which they apologise to the foreigner. But the idea that Anglo-Norman poets had a good knowledge of neither English nor French is astonishing.

How had they come to be denied a mother-tongue? Without citing Gower, can it be asserted that men of Parisian learning like Robert Grosse Teste or Peckham - and they were for long numerous enough to constitute a "nation" at the University of Paris, - had no clear idea of what they were trying to write? If they had not been confident, like modern French-Canadians, that their version of French, was as good as that of Paris, they would no doubt have been capable of producing works much more resembling attempts at Parisian French, which they had had every opportunity of learning. Again, the history of any one language and its poetry, or comparison between those of nations in different stages of civilisation, suggests generally that they evolve from a cumbersome infancy towards simplicity and the breakdown of primitive complication. An occasional stasis, when fashion or some other cause maintains an artificial tradition, is an exception whose rapid passing only

proves the rule. An artificial language such as Anglo-Norman seems to have been for the majority after 1250, (Prior suggests that its whole existence in England was artificial, a political expedient; in no other country did the Northmen and their descendants impose their language or resist the assimilation of native speech and habits) might be expected to have an artificial and perhaps complicated versification, just as the sonnet is the monument of a particular phase of Italian civilisation.

The view that Anglo-Norman poets were unable to count their fingers, or at least were unable to place those fingers with any precision on the syllables of French, is more understandable, though this inability would be due to the rapid changes in the language rather than lack of such advanced arithmetical skill or of rhythmical sense.

Professor Prior, (Romania 1923), gave examples of poetic tours de force in two or three languages to show that versifiers capable of fashioning perfectly good Latin and English verses, apparently insisted on spoiling them with French ones atrocious if judged by the method of counting syllables. He went on to urge the influence of English versification and to come round once more to the idea, scouted by Meyer, Vising and others, of an accentual rather than syllabic scansion for Anglo-Norman verse. Even the works of early and "correct" poets he says, lend themselves to iambic rhythm, as, for example, the St Thomas of Benoît of St Albans; later they can be scanned by stresses. This accentual basis seems to grow more marked as time goes on, till poems mingling two or three languages, with French alone, we are asked to believe, preserving a syllabic basis, become a regular genre.

The graceful, Villonesque prayer of c. 1300 in the Leominster ms., quoted by Prior (p.178), bears repetition;

Maíden móður málde
 Oléz cel óreysóun
 From sháme þóu me shíldo
 E dé ly málfelóun
 For lóve of þíne chíldo
 Me ménez dé tresóun
 Ích wés wód and wíldo
 Óre su ón prisóun.

This hardly betokens ignorance of both languages, either in the poet or the public to which he addressed himself. Both apparently felt the same rhythm in both English and French lines, or the poem would have no unity; it was no doubt this rhythm which governed the value to be placed upon the syllables of the French and led to the use of the "barbarism" de ly.

This example suggests an explanation other than ignorance and corruption for the phenomena of our text. The seemingly fanciful way in which atonic e is scattered abroad in it is only paralleled in contemporary English versification, where it had this optional value in contributing to a stress-rhythm which took little account of the number of syllables. The divorce of spelling from pronunciation, the hall-mark of modern English to which we cling with touching fidelity, had already begun, and written e was not always pronounced. It is generally admitted that the French of England shared the same development. In many apparently "incorrect" verse of our poem, particularly decasyllables like v.1701 quoted above, also:

Qu il out eue en meinte besoigne (2135)
 Ke pointe, qe helte, qe entreter (2201)
 Bele temps fist, li soleille levast (2529)

one or more of the e's must be merely decorative. Champe is, as

already noted, generally so written, yet at vv. 3005-6 it rimes with sulant. Numerous are such ornamental es at the end of lines, satisfying no doubt our author's artistic eye, e.g. Arthur's cur (spelt thus at v.2069, and nowhere else). As for the value of words normally containing hiatus, like cheine, treisun, realme, we may suppose that sometimes, especially in the Brut proper, the author gave them their ancient French value, at others, particularly in his own portion, the value they had at the time of borrowing into English. As in English, e could no doubt be elided, not only before vowels, but also before consonants. In her introduction to the Black Prince, Miss Pope thinks that Gower's use of a les, de les, du for de là, etc.. was due less to ignorance than "a metrically convenient forgetfulness of the declension of the article". (Cf. de ly in the Leominster prayer).

Such compromise and complication, whatever Meyer, Visling and the others have said, is foreign neither to English character nor to English versification. In the works of Chaucer, born about the time of our ms, we find the same arbitrary use of e and the same arbitrary accentuation of French words. As Prior points out, he accents words like honour sometimes on the second syllable, sometimes on the first. The modern pronunciation of this and other loan-words like absence, baron, exploit indicates a process which they may have been undergoing even before they began to be used in English, a process just as likely to have worked upon all polysyllabic words in Anglo-Norman, whether they passed into English or not.

We must remember that Chaucer was incomprehensible for

his own countrymen, and pitied as a boorish pioneer, till the 18th century discovery that in his verse *e* sometimes had a value, sometimes not, and that French words were sometimes accented in French fashion, sometimes in English. It was then found that he wrote generally irreproachable iambic ten syllable lines. Even Visiting admits of the learned Gower: "for him it was possible to combine adherence to English rhythm with the French syllabic system". G.C. Macaulay says of Gower's work: "With all the correctness, the verses of the *Mirour* have an unmistakably English rhythm ... the verse is in a certain sense accentual as well as syllabic, the writer imposing upon himself generally the rule of the alternate beat of accents, and seldom allowing absolutely weak syllables to stand in the even place of his verse", (p. lxiiv of the introduction to his edition of Gower). Did Chaucer and Gower, then, achieve a sudden success not built upon the efforts of predecessors writing in English, or Anglo-Norman, or both? Meyer and Visiting's comparison of Italo-French poetry with Anglo-Norman is evidence against rather than for their thesis; Italian dialects had stronger stresses than French, and Italian poetry was destined, like English, to be based upon accentual feet rather than syllabic rhythm.

Koch's view (Chardri, p. xliii) seems the most natural: it is hardly possible that for two or three centuries the inhabitants of England lost all sense of the rhythm which was a basic element in their poetry before and since. In criticising Koch, Visiting (*Versification a-n*, p. 56) admits that of course this loss must have been gradual, not sudden. Then would the feeling of rhythm, having been gradually lost, be suddenly regained? If it

seems to be resurrected with Layamon and to blaze out suddenly in Chaucer's triumphant welding together of both French and Anglo-Saxon elements in language and prosody, it can hardly have been absent from the French efforts of English versifiers all the time. As French poetry, from being an importation, gradually became a home product, we can only presume that English-born poets, while their medium of expression was the Anglo-Norman language, felt an English rhythm in their verses; they would often place an iotus where there was none, or only a weak one, in continental French - the latter itself seems to have known more strongly-marked accents than the modern language. The process must have increased in strength till the end of Anglo-Norman literature, Chaucer only utilising what was already accepted in both languages used in England. By some process of reasoning, to which he adheres forty years later in "Anglo-Norman Language and Literature", Visiting alleges in the page cited above that the Anglo-Normans' loss of the sense of rhythm is proved by the laments of William of Wadington, Lucas de Gast, the author of St Aedward, and others, for their loss of "le sentiment de la langue elle-meme". This loss is not at issue, nor that of the feeling for French rhythm which was its consequence. But instead of proving that a nation lost its sense of rhythm, these losses surely make it only more probable that it substituted for the lost French one the accentual rhythm which forms a principal basis of poetry for the English mind.

If in the present text, therefore, we seek stresses rather than syllables, it will perhaps appear less of a metrical enigma.

We have seen that our author, by his insertions and alterations, seems to have little sense of the French scansion. Yet we cannot accuse him of lacking a rhythmical sense, even in lines syllabically "correct". He makes very numerous alterations as compared with ^{Le}Roux de Lincy's basic ms, (now F.f. 1450) obviously a continental one, and a still-considerable number compared with the 13th-century Anglo-Norman Penrose ms utilised by Arnold. These bear not merely on the matter, changes in which have already been discussed, but even more upon order and choice of words; for the latter class of alteration it is usually difficult to see any reasons other than metrical.

There are numerous examples to show that where Arnold's text and Egerton agree to differ in word order from Le Roux de Lincy's, a definite alternate beat results. In the following only L. and E. are given, as A agrees with E except in orthographical detail;

- | | | |
|----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| L 5033: | Qui a vint a vint mil escus | |
| E 22; | Ki vint od plus de mil esud | (A 4916) |
| L 5907: | Et partot estoit rois clamés | |
| E 346; | Et reis estoit par tot clamez | (A 5786) |
| L 8140: | Qu'il ait merci qui merci quiert | |
| E 1484: | Ke merci ait qe merci quert | (A 7936) |
| L 5404: | Que partie a lui en sosmist | |
| E 207: | Ke un partie a lui susmist | (A 5283) |
| L 13043: | Car plus que nul home l'amot | |
| E 2664: | Mult l'aveit chier et mult l'amout | (A 12637) |
| L 13060: | Ou Romain volaissent u non | |
| E 2677: | Volisent cil de Rome ou noun | (A 12654) |
| L 6540: | Il te tornera a honor | |
| E 675: | Si t'ert turné a grant honor | (A 6394) |

Other examples are vv. 2659 (L 13037, A 12632), 2687 (L 13292, A 12888), 2759 (L 13678, A 13273).

It is not the immediate purpose, however, to demonstrate

how our author shared a particular rhythm with other Anglo-Norman scribes, or perhaps with Wace himself as distinct from continental copyists, but that changes by which he differs from the other known versions accentuate the tendency to alternate beats. The first six examples which follow are lines in which he shows different word order from L and A; the rest do not appear in any of the known versions, or occur in the final part, being in both cases presumably the work of the author of the ms.

- | | | |
|---------|---|----------|
| L 5053: | Priveement l'a desarmé- | (A 4938) |
| E 32: | Le corps ad pris ot desarmé | |
| L 5127: | A Porcestre sunt retornées | (A) |
| E 80: | Et a Porcestre retournez | |
| L 5860: | Constantins a Rome manoit | (A 5739) |
| E 303: | Et Constantin a Rome estoit | |
| L 5926: | A qui Engleterre lairoit | (A 5804) |
| E 364: | A ki sun rogne guorporeit | |
| L 6305: | Et plusors mors et detracions | (A 6186) |
| E 573: | Plus de xv (monosyllables?) mil en ont oies | |
| L 6558: | De sa main destre le seigna | (A 6412) |
| E 687: | Levast la destre, sis seignant | |
| L 6613: | Un cotel avoit, sol' ferri | (A 6467) |
| E 726: | S' espé out trait, si le ferri | |
| | | |
| E 233: | De Rome un baron remueit | |
| 272: | Cil fu de cointe eloquence | |
| 328: | Et les richesses assemblez | |
| 334: | Meint chivaler i amenout | |
| 380: | Car puis apres l' en poiserast | |
| 538: | Et les paiens sunt dolerouse | |
| 574: | Ke des Norreis qe de Daneis | |
| 738: | Al Parloiment fu cil venu | |
| 923: | De li servir a sun devis | |
| 2221: | Mult i aveit solempnité | |
| 3195: | Bien solt sun Realme maintenir | |
| 3268: | Qu'il poet la victorie aveit. | |

These examples, which could be multiplied, are sufficient to show that even when keeping within octosyllabic limits, the author leans towards an iambic rhythm. English readers can often be detected trying to read this into French verse, but it would be difficult for anyone to avoid doing so in the above lines and many others. Further, there seems a tendency towards hemistichic

division of the verse (marked by internal rhyme or assonance at v. 22 and elsewhere - see below) with a pause at the half-way point, a feature of traditional English versification, with its parallelism and repetition. It would be difficult to find examples where our author changes a line of Wace already containing this division or lending itself to iambic rhythm.

Vising (A-N Lang. & Lit., p. 84) says "It is probable the octosyllabic line never has had a caesura, as it has not in modern times". Fifteen of the above nineteen examples, with a caesura, sometimes a strong one, after the fourth syllable, seem to show that Anglo-Norman verse did not conform to this feeling that the French octosyllabic is too short to have a caesura, and also to illustrate a tendency to symmetrise the lines of Wace. The Norman poet, however, had already given his successors an example for nonconformity. A few lines from near the beginning of our ms, corresponding exactly to the lines of Wace on which they are based, are sufficient proof of this.

E 3:	Dis anz fu hois, ot puis finast
10:	Emperere ert, sun chief jurast
26:	Sun cunseiller ot sun baron
28:	Romeins ferir, Romeins abatre
92:	Et al lancier ot al jetter.

In vv. 32, 303, 726 quoted above, as well as in lines which he shares with Arnold's text, we find our author preferring an order elsewhere, which gives a pause after the fourth syllable instead of ^{elsewhere,} as in Wace. Other cases not shared with A are:

L 9893:	Artur l'ama mult et ot chiero	(A 9636)
E 1962:	Arthur l'amast et la tint chier	
L 9949:	Et cascuns i avoit s'espie	(A 9712)
E 1992:	Et chescun d'els i out s' espie	

- L 8520: Mult se plaint et mult sospira (A 8312)
 E 1713: Mult fu dolent et suspirast
- L 7337: Olés com faite diablle (A 7155)
 E 1107: Otez c'on fait diablerie
- L 6253: Et les ullages toz vaincuz (A 6114)
 E 538: Et les paiens sunt dolerouse
- L 6591: Trois vallés en ot, le plus grant.. (A 6445)
 E 710: Treis valetz out, et li plus grantz...

It is tempting to suppose the author inserted a non-etymological e, with syllabic value, in peust (v. 795): "Bien les peust, bien les amast," with the idea of dividing the line symmetrically by the semi-colon which he writes after peust. Wace's line is: "Et bien les pot et abevra." (L 6760) or "Bien les peut, bien les abevra," (A 6604, ms Paris f.f. 1416). Was there intention to emphasise this medial pause by use of atonic e ? It has already been noted that in about 100 apparently nonasyllabic lines the extra syllable is a mute at the fifth. In most of these cases a distinct pause follows, e.g.

- E 46: Mais mult petite sei arestant
- L 6037: Qui ont maint de ses homes mort
 A 5906: Ki de ses homes unt maint mort
 E 432: Ki de ses homes ont meinte mort
- L 5007: Ni ne lor valt tenir droiture (A 4890)
 E 6: Ne lour volt faire nule droiture
- L 5336: Engleterre premierement (A 5213)
 E 157: En Engleterre primerement
- L 5397: En Bretagne les envoierent (A 5270)
 E 200: Et en Bretagne les envoierent
- L 5877: Et les Romains sofrir nes porent (A 5738)
 E 320: Et li Romeine sufrer nel purent
- L 5832: Mena a Rome par chiereté (A 5713)
 E 283: Menast a Rome pur chiereté

L 6179: Et une nue vint pluose (A 6042)
 E 496: Et une nue mult pluviouse (

L 6221: Des meschines firent ocire (A 6082)
 E 518: Ki les meschines en fist ocire

L 6490: Que grans besoins m'i amena (A 6348)
 E 657: Par grant besoigne me en chacez

L 7538: Par tote Gales et oerchier (A 7356)
 E 1210: Par tote Gales et oncerchier
 E 2962: Ke nule pleindre ne se poeit
 E 3022: Povres et riches de halt parage

These examples, of course, may merely be taken to confirm the disappearance of the atonic e. On the other hand, given the tendencies we have noted, the author may have been availing himself of its optional value in giving the lines a medial pause with iambic rhythm. There seem to be a large number of examples in the Cot. Vitell. A x ms of the Brut, some hundred years older than the Egerton, of a similar occurrence of the e mute at the hemistich.

If the above seem evidence of iambic rhythm, it may lead to an explanation of a great many of the apparently irrational e-mutes which intrude everywhere in our text, and in others. In line 432 mainte has of course no right to its e, and the line could be read "correctly", as in A: "Ki de ses hommes ont maint mort", still an improvement on the order in L. But maint and Mort would be two heavy syllables in succession; our author probably inserted the e to give an iambic rhythm with medial pause. This is the more likely as there are many other examples of what seems a rhythmical use of this letter which we have already seen apparently filling out the octosyllabic.

As: 152: Mult bele fu sa finement
 261: Xi anz petite plus aveit
 417: Et les Romeines gueroreit
 502: Et meinte noie perillier
 576: Un mure firent sur un fosse (:Escoco. But in vv 579,
 638 the e does not seem to have a rôle)

785: Quéle pàrt vòstre guére cóurt
 1007: Ké a eise tóte s'en fúrent
 1468: Un fórt chéine de fére tint
 1470: En hált s'ad sés meînes levéz
 1650: Passéens, dit-il, enténde mei
 2717: Tóte l'ivére / í sojourné
 2865: Tótes les Reîs enguéroîást
 3005: Et lé secúnde jòur suiánt

Perhaps the variation in the spelling of *natus* is due, occasionally at all events, to its position at the weak or strong syllable of an iambus, as in vv. 871-2:

Ou fústes neéz, et qué querréz?

Héngist, qe Meîre et aînz nez fú ...

Cf. vv. 1, 2, 1085, 1227, 1645, 2346. But there are perhaps as many cases of spelling with one *e* at what should be the strong syllable, e.g. 142, 490, 709, 805. The alternation of *qi* or *ki* (strong ?) with *qe* or *ke* (weak?) for the nominative relative, and of *le* and *li*, may be sometimes not unconnected with metre, though it would be dangerous to generalise from a few examples like:

Envoyer lui qe lí baptiserást,

Et qi la ley lí enseignast (163-4)

De lá langúre qe lí tenelt (325/)

The great majority of cases of *qe* for *qi* (25 in the first 800 lines) fall on what would be the weak syllable of an iambic foot.

An iambic rhythm seems recognisable also in many of the "irregular" lines of seven, nine or more syllables if, as often in English, a catalectic syllable be counted strong, replacing a whole foot, an occasional anapest be allowed, or an *e*-mute be elided before a consonant, as:

107: S'il volt sòul sis hóme dévenir

151: Còil sé cuntint mult nóblement

252: Et as chîef de sét jòurs déviást

280: Archiêrs et chivalêrs amenást

299: Octâves les prist, sis décolást

381: Ne ké sun eîre fáce dé Conán

418: Pur Valéntín et Gratién q'il háît

- 441: Pur céo Bretáigne mínor l'únt nomé
 522: Kar méint bon chivalér en ért passé
 762: Vórtigér qe tráitre fú
 843: Et a bréfe térme révendróient
 1662: Coróne fist hált si sé tundi
 1803: As cóuntenánz et ás encóinémentz
 2290: Ne sáverás en núle liéu tapír
 2658: Béduér feríst parmi le córps
 2699: Et el córps d'un láunce náveréz
 3079: Od un gáine qé a lí fu tráit
 3158: Múlt par ésteit séinto hém
 3215: As póvres fréres dé réligión.

As seen in Chaucer, 14th century English poets found no harm in accenting the same word differently in different places or in accenting French words English fashion. The violence done to French ears by such accentuation as the above could not have been felt by the nation which produced Law French, no doubt largely a crystallisation (or petrification) of the French spoken here in the 13th and 14th centuries.

If we admit some evidence in the foregoing of the iambic metre which was soon to be firmly entrenched in English poetry, a good many other lines, (or indeed some of the above) may simply represent the older English tradition of fixed accents with variable number of weak syllables, soon to give way altogether, with Gower, Chaucer and their successors, to isometrical iambic metre.

This would explain the facility with which the scribe inserts proper names, extra words etc., without apparently feeling that he was doing violence. English prosody allowed such freedom. Thus four (or more) stresses may be intended in polysyllabic lines such as :

- 66: Kí ne poéint turnér a la navýe
640 : A Lúndres esteít a ióele ténse (or iambic: A Lún-
dres esteít á ióele ténse?)
1036: Rówen esteít devánt le Róí defubló
1747: En le chemýn encuntrást un messáge
(or iambic: En lé chemýn oncuntrast ún messáge?)
2137: De íre ét de mál talént fu esmeú (or: De íre ét de
mál talént fu ésméú)
3173: La batáille de Léwes fú en sun tómps
3259: Apres lí régne sun ríz qe ~~or~~ ést

It is possible that in many cases we ought not to place the accent on verbal endings. English verbs were not so accented and the development of Anglo-Norman ones, for example the change of conjugation I/infinitives into conjugation IV often suggests that they underwent an analogous shift of accent (cf. Tanqueray, Evolution pp. 437, 793).

Another attribute of English versification, alliteration, may be intentional in this text - it can at least be found in a good many lines, though of course not absent from Wace and continental poets. If anything, examples are most numerous in the last part, but it is interesting to note how changes made in Wace have resulted, perhaps not by accident, in alliteration or an increase of it. It is obvious in the English lines of the prayer quoted above, and can be detected in the French. Examples in the Egerton text are:

8. Et tote lour troud entollie
(L 5009; A 4892: Et le treu[^] entoll[^])
lev

- 50: Si r'est sur sun destrier muntez
(L 5083: Et est sor le ceval montés, A 4966: Si r'est sur sun cheval muntés).
- 107: S'il volt soul sis homme devenir
(L 5164; A 5047: Se il vult ses hom devenir)
- 125: A la meschine marier
(L 5186: A la pucele marier; A as Eg.)
- 186: Et grant demeines lour donaat
(L 5381: Et grant maisnie lor dona; A as Eg.)
- 2824: En lour langage los nomeront
(L 14082: Et varierent et muerent; A as Eg.)
- 2585: Cum un cheine qe cheet pur vent
(L 11943: Comme chaines qui ciot par vent; A as Eg.)
- 2914: Dedenz un mois devia
2929: En repairant par franchise prist
2962: Ke nule pleindre ne se poeit
- "3022: Povres et riches de halt parage
" 3063: Les avogles fait lour veue aver
" 3068-9: Qi la cunté de Kent tenoit;
" A tort ad la terre seisé.
" 3078: Kar ferru fu parmi la cervelle
" 3100: Al darain cil malades devint
" 3144: Grant doel fu qant fu finy
3153: Fu Engleterre entredit
" 3162: Le fiz Roi Phelippe de France nee
" 3136: Cist esteit reis poestis (repeated at v. 3184)
" 3199: Ni ama losengier no larron
" 3210: Cil tint la terre, si le gardast
" 3215: As povres freres de religion
" 3247: Puis le roi par force prist
" 3249-50: A vile mort le fist morir /Et vilement le fist
mourdrir
"3257: De la langure qe li tenoit (Cf Keats' pathetic
"Alone and paelly loitering")
" 268: Qil poet la victorie aver.

These examples are indicative^{rather} than exhaustive.

Nearly a century-and-a-half before our poem, Layamon's versification, was, as Prior pointed out (loc.cit.) a mixture of accents and alliteration, and, be it said, of rhyme. Twenty years after it, Langland's "Vision of Piers the Plowman" shows that the old alliterative-accentual system is not dead. Not long after -

that again, Chaucer's rhymed iambs do not scorn alliteration. England was in this, as it has ever been, a repository of things old and new, the English a nation of adapters. Our poet seems sometimes to be looking back to Layamon, sometimes forward towards Chaucer. If he keeps the French octosyllabic, we cannot be sure that he does not feel a non-French iambic rhythm in it - his rearrangement of the order in his model frequently seems to aim at this. If he breaks into polysyllabic metre, we again seem to feel an iambic or at least an English accentual rhythm. He uses the atonic e, not with preoccupations of grammar, etymology or consistency, but perhaps for ends connected with rhythm. He treats the language he writes in as an artistic medium, to be shaped and arranged for his purpose, just as he "improves" Wace from the standpoint of English rhythm. It is the attitude, not of ignorance merely, but of aesthetic detachment towards a language which is no longer a living tradition but an accomplishment.

β Enjambement calls for little remark, except to point out its frequency. Vising says (op.cit. p.85) "on the whole enjambement is rare in Anglo-Norman poetry". Prior, on the contrary, says (loc.cit.p.174) that it is freely employed, the strong accentual rhythm now giving the verse its unity, and leading also to the weakening^{en} of rhyme. The example of English must here again have made itself felt. The sense runs on very commonly from one line to the next in this ms, e.g. vv. 10, 13, 47, 93, 1506, 2768, 2770. In all these and many other cases the corresponding lines of Wace show the same running on. But there are examples also in the modifications, as:

Lî senatour soulement
 Les envoieit ignolement
 Un Legiun des chivalers
 Ki mult furent pruz et fiers (vv. 567-70)

Compare Wace: Une legion solement
 Lor envoierent de lor gent (L vv. 6299-6300)

Examples in the final part are of even more emphatic kind:

En repairant, par franchise prist
 A femme demoiseal Judith (vv. 2929-30)

Mais qd le aide de le eslit
 Seint Johan, arcevesqe de Everwic. (vv. 2939-40)

Icel oure q'il nasquie,
 Seint Dunstan en oie
 Les Angeles qi chantierent
 Emont en le firmament
 Ke lon poes en serra
 Tant cum Edgar regnera. (vv 2953-8)

Car Estrice, sa marastre, lo fist ocire
 A doel et a grant martire
 Pur covetise de la regne doner
 A Alvered sun fiz pur heriter (vv. 2975-8)

Other examples are at vv. 3034, 3044, 3078, 3149 etc.etc,

C Rhyme

The outstanding feature of the rhymes employed in the present ms is the apparent contrast between the care distinguishing a good many, and what seems to be lack of it in others.

Vising in particular (op.cit., and "Sur la versification Anglo-Normande"), called attention to this contradiction in Anglo-Norman versification. He says, however, "Une rime inadmissible en ancien français mais répétée en Anglo-Normand prouve que ce n'est pas une négligence." He therefore allows rhymes like or:ur as being in accord with the phonetic development of the language; also the rhyming of er infinitives with words in ere, owing to Anglo-Norman loss of final e mute, and such rhymes as avis:poetiz, parenz: sens, marz: cors, devant: gent, oie(audiam): proie .

The Egerton text abounds in examples of these and analogous spellings for sounds evidently considered to be rhymes. Thus plur rhymes with quoreour (1213) and estour (2758); demuro: emporour (2394), jours: honurs (3037), Angieu: Politou (2468), pruz: nevolz (2480) touz (2938), hours: socure (407). succuro: honur (647). The phonetic identity of o and u for Anglo-Norman writers receives further demonstration in sunt: font (892), parfonde: funde (1311), homes: sumes (890, 2372), Rome: summe (137, 2252) Knout: bot (2998), socuruz: dolerouse (1537), plurent (pleuror): Keurent (courir, 2144), ~~amorous~~: orgollous (3095). The reduction of ui to u, noted in many spellings in this piece, is shown by bruit: tout (2294), eussent: fuissent (2827).

There is little need to insist further on the disregard of final e mute, which is shown in the rhymes as well as in the metre. Beside rhymes looked upon as normal by Vising, there are others whose frequency, and what we know of phonetic development in Anglo-Norman, seem to give them sanction, e.g. the rhyming of past participles and other words ending in e, ie, and i, of preterites in erent, ierent, and irent and infinitives in er, ier, ir and ire; of ei with e of different origins; of all the different imperfect endings (in ai, ei, oi, ou and o); of the different classes of preterite endings (a:ad:ast:at, i:ie; it:ist, ut:ust; out:olt:ot)- for examples see Phonetics and Orthography.

Other ^{unusual} rhymes are due to the way in which certain consonants, e.g. r, n, s, consonnes mouillées, changed, disappeared, or perhaps reappeared in spelling when they had ceased to be pronounced. Most of these again have been discussed in the sections on Phonetics and Orthography, but it seems convenient to bring them

together here: Apostoils:gloirs (165, cf. Gregoire: apostoire, 2839, and Gregories:apostoilles in the Roy. 13 A xxi ms of the Brut; also vile:dire in the Riote), ordiners: senez 1481, on assez:nommez (infin.) 2452, ordeinez: justiserz (2602. Cf. potters: demandez, volenters:priez in the Riote, damage:barge in the Cot. Vitell. ms A x, f. 121a), travers:airez (aherdre, 1575), prest: 2436, ert(baptesme:creme 2857, femme:regne 1799. 2482), home:ossoigne 2544 regne:realme 3051, aime:pleine 946, nofs:remes 1070, 2001, estrif:vifs 2262, naie:plentive 884, treit:empeint 3079, vindrent: firent 2987, sojourne:halour 2742, ; Burgoine 2716, troisoun:jour 1133, voile(voeu): doel 604, feels:cunseilles (2322, cf. loil: cunseil, 385), russeaus:munceals 2704, vassas:mals 1718, novolz: pruz 2480, perde:couvert 2756, eslit:Everwie 2939, francois (f.pl. riches (475, survival of françoises: riçoises in L, franceises: richeises in A), Muntford:efforz 3177, mortz:aforce 2734, lui:avie 3221, fiz:poestiz (3135, cf. sis:poestis, 3183), toms:parenz 3173 Some of these, if there is any reality in the spellings, are perhaps by this time assonances rather than rhymes, resulting particularly from changes which had taken place since the original rhymes were made.

There are a number of rhymes, permissible perhaps in England if not in France, which the author has evidently been at some pains to make pleasing to eye as well as ear. Decorative o's are found in certeine:demoine 1345, abite(noun): petite (maso . pl. 742) , cunseille(noun):merveille (1st pers. sing, 1195) Arthure: oure 2069, lie(lui): vie (3047, cf. lui:avie above),

emfeblie(masc.):maladie 3185, morire:occire 3129, Declension and syntax are adjusted for the sake of rhyme in guise (plur.):aprise (fem.plur.,150), descunfis (fem) ;pris (masc)} 1979,) cunquis (^{gentis} (masc plur 2168), (fem.plur.) enmaladie(pret): amye (masc.plur.2967) gastez (fem. plur.),: entrez (masc.plur.1883), armez (masc.plur.): gueroiez (perf.part. 3073), trei:Kei 2547, botelers; brances d'asciers 2654, meuz (masc.plur.);par grant vertuz 1343, assez:nomez (infin.2452) edifiers: chivalers (447, cf. thirteen cases of infinitives ending in s noted by Ida Wirtz in the Hanover ms-op. cit.p. 48). Even meaning seems to be altered in Abbez(abbés);Evesquiez (evêques) 2186). That our scribe was capable of respecting declension for rhyme as well as altering it, is shown by noun: hom (nom. sing., 3157) in the part of which he seems the author.

As the desinence/-ent seems to have optional value metrically for the Anglo-Norman versifier, this was probably also the case in rhyming. Rhymes like cremeit:esteient 1401, aveit:toneient 2055, were thus no doubt satisfactory to him. A very large number of others can only be called rhymes if verbal/-ent in Anglo-Norman constituted of itself a satisfactory rhyming-syllable. Some of the examples are perhaps, though not necessarily, due to carelessness in the omission of ei, oi before -ent, or in writing/-eient for erent, and vice versa. Emendations for these are tentatively put forward later, but the ms readings are kept here. Their number suggests that they were not all accidental, and did not shock our scribe.

Thus we find (apparently) presents rhyming with (a| imperfects or ~~conditionals~~ (perhaps/-eient, after the reduction to eient, became/-ent by the change ei>e), guient: disoient 519.

tournent:saveint 1307, venoient:lissent 1701, vognent:cumbatient 2089, soleient:voillent 2338, also three presents(?) gueroient:manacent 838, exilient:espansissent 529, morgent:devient (devier, 2901.

(b) Presents rhyming with preterites, e.g. entrerent:robbent (618, possibly the sign for er has been omitted in the ms, cf. 926) ~~this line, with the present robbery, reads more like even~~ garirent:guerpissent (1094, both imperfects in Wace) gueroient:destruerent 1349, apaierent:2833, damagierent 2985.

(c) Imperfects or conditionals rhyming with preterites, e.g. cumbatierent:diffendient 1541, parloient:tollerent 948, voloint:eliront 1129, diroient:cunseillierent 1479, aportoint:acordierent 2424, releverent:quidoient 2784. A number of these "preterites" may be conditionals in which, as suggested above, the ending has undergone reduction to -ent.

(d) -Erent preterites rhyme with -urent preterites, (perhaps through a stage represented by the rhyme furent:muerent, 2458, or simply by shifting the accent on to the ending), e.g. furent:amenent 1777, chanterent:3087, aprestierent:urent 1899, durent:chaierent 2903.

Such "rhymes" as gueroient:fusent 862 do not enter into any of the above classes. The last two verbs, however, as well as morgent:devient 2901 occur at the end of lines containing seven syllables only, unless the -ent is counted. Perhaps, therefore it was intended to be accented and counted, in these and other cases given above. This idea is supported by occlstrent (at end of line containing six syllables without -ent); ensement 1742, vegnent (item): attargement 2189, chantierent (seven syllables without -ent); firment 2955. Verbal -ent thus seems capable of

receiving an accent if necessary for the rhyme. Vising quotes malement;ferirent,soleyent: gent from Political Songs(Wright), and reminds us that Gaston Paris showed that such rhymes were not unknown on the continent. It seems apposite to note that there was in medieval Irish poetry a rhyming tour de force called aírd-rinn in which an accented syllable at the end of the first line of a couplet rhymed with an unaccented one at the end of the second, (or the accent could fall on the penultimate and antepenultimate respectively) as in the lines:

The slender free palms of hér
Than gull on sea are whiter.

Though men owe respect to thóm
Presage of woe - a poem.

A far greater than ány
Man has killed my Cómpany.

Hyde, who gives these translated examples, (Literary History of Ireland, p. 483) points out that a highly evolved poetical technique, including aírd-rinn and the seven-syllable line, existed by the seventh century in Ireland, and supports Zeuss' opinion that Europe owes rhyme to the Celts. Were the seven-syllable line and the rhymes discussed above, which appear to require shift of accent, really borrowed from Ireland by the Anglo-Normans? Of course, if our author was Irish, he would merely been utilising what had already been the property of the bards of his native land for centuries. It happens, however, that the two best known Anglo-Norman pieces of Irish origin, the Fortification of New Ross (Harl. 913), and Dermot, have no examples of this species of rhyme. The latter is indeed remarkable in the non-appearance of -ent verbal forms at the rhyme. Both are of course much earlier than Egerton.

There remain four pairs of line-endings which seem neither rhymes nor assonances in the form written, dieux; autiers 910, rames; meins 2244, (correct rhymes in Wace - see Phonetics) Angovyn; Poitou 2154 (this seems absent-mindedness when Anjou was available), aveit; demeintenant 1831. There are also five lines which do not rhyme, generally through abridgment of Wace, though as a rule truncated portions are joined with some ingenuity. These are vv. 575 (or 577 - the endings of 575-7 are: auné, fosse, Escoco), 2109, 2546, 2567, 2806, (the author probably considered that porté 2109 rhymed with espee, achevé (fem.) in the following verses. There is another example of three lines in rhyme at vv. 1766-8. Onur rhymes with itself at 101-2 - there seems unhoarding repetition in this passage; Wace's rhyme is amor; honor. Aforce also rhymes with itself at 1977-8, but the word may have different meanings in the two cases. There is an example of rime embrassée at vv. 2212-5, and numerous cases of four lines rhyming together.

Vising, once more, is of the opinion, with Meyer, that this phenomenon is characteristic of the Anglo-Norman poets, occurring early, he says, and in the most correct poems. (Anglo-Norman Lang. and Lit. p. 88). In actual fact, of the 58 groups of 4 lines containing one rhyme in our ms (55 in the part based upon the Brut) 29 are borrowed from Wace's original. Many of the others are caused by the bringing together of rhyming lines through the cuts made in Wace's text. The latter shows, besides many other cases of 4-line rhyme-groups not given in our ms, at least two cases of 6-line groups (Le Roux de Lincy's edition, vv. 6853-8, 10048-53, Arnold's edition 6697-6702, 9803-8, 1023-8). It looks as if the origin of this feature is Norman rather than Anglo-Norman.

A tendency has been noted to divide the lines of this piece rhythmically into hemistiches. This impression is heightened by a number of internal rhymes and assonances falling on the fourth syllable or second stressed syllable in the line, a common feature in English ballad verse. Accident may be their explanation, as of other phenomena noted, but they seem more numerous in the present text than in Wace, certainly more numerous ^{than} in Le Roux de Lincoln's text. Examples:

L 5033: Qui i vint a vint mil escus
A 4916: Ki vint od plus de mil escuz
E 22: Ki vint od plus de mil escud

E 87: Arviragus, qĩ esteit pruz (in neither ed. W)
E 92: Et al lancier, et al jetter (in both ed.)
E 106: Une feille ad qe li durrast (")

L 5338: A 5215 Parler oi de Jesu Crist
E 573-4: Parler oist de Jesu Crist

E 5734: Plus de xv mil en ont ocis (not in either ed.)
Ke des Norrois qe de Daneis

L 6982: Od les Saisneset od Bretons (as A)
E 931: Od ses Soissons, od ces Bretuns

L 6886: Et dont estes, et u alés
A 6728: U fustes nez et que querez.
E 871: Ou fustes neez et qe quorrez.

L 6846: Mais d'autre part fu angoises
A 6690: Mais de dous choses est ainsus
E 837: Mais de dous chose fu anguisouse

E 1006: Le jour manjurent et tant burent (L, A, have
regular preterite)
E 1140: Lez l'abbeye d'Aumesbirie (L Ambresbere,
A Ambresbire).

L 7625: Si li dist, se estre poeit
A 7437: Si demanda s'estre poeit
E 1267: Si demandeit qe estre poeit.
E 1384: Flambe voler, meisons chaier (L caoir, A chaeir)
E 1414: Naferez chair, chaiz murir (L chaoir, A chaeir)
L 8114: E tot si baron altresí
A 7910: E trestuit si home altresí
E 1466: Et tote si homme altresí.

173

E 1470: En halt s'ad ses meines levez (in neither ed. of W)
 E 1506: Pur visiter le cimiter (L cimmeterre, A cime-
 L 8823, A 8597: As gas, as ris, as ^{cehemenz} Ambesbire)
 E 1803: As countenanz et as enceinementz
 E 3027: Qatre anz et demi en pees vesqui
 E 3106: A Westmouster devant le autier.

The cases of assonance between the medial and final syllable, many of them not to be found in Wace, are too numerous to be quoted. Not a few may have been considered rhymes by the author, judging by the standards of rhyme shown above. There are also a few examples of rhyming at the hemistich, some of them in Wace. The following is not in this author:

"Arthur" out noun de sa bounté,
 Dunt grant renoun ad puis esté (1275-6)

The second line is changed from "A grant parole a puis esté" (L 9052, A 8818).

In the matter of rhyme, then, as well as of metrics generally, our author resembles most contemporary writers of French in England, "Il prend son bien où il le trouve". If he could take such liberties as we have noted to satisfy the eye, we cannot suppose he shrank from similar ways of pleasing the ear, producing, like other Anglo-Norman poets, an astonishing medley of good and even ingenious rhymes with others whose secret we have lost, if they had one. We are reminded irresistibly in his work of the versification of traditional English poetry which has come down to us from those times. The lines on the birth of Edgar, the first six of which seem to show a change from 4-stress to 3-stress rhythm are surely the echo if not the substance of a Christmas carol:

Icel oure q'il nasquie
 Seint Dunstan en oie

Les Angales q' chantierent
 Emont en le firmament
 Ke lon pees en serra
 Tant cum Edgar regnera;
 Et si avint certainement:
 Tiel plenté i aveit entre tot gent
 Ke nule pleindre ne se poeit.

To such versification it would be useless to apply the rules of French prosody. There is no notion of the rhythm attained by syllabic correctness but, as we have seen, there is reason to suspect that other concepts of rhythm, and of prosody in general, are wielding their influence. As the insular language had its own development, almost cut off from that of the continent, the metrics adapted to it must have undergone similar change. A nation does not lose its native rhythm because it lisps in foreign numbers.

The study of this markedly altered version of a classic shows it to be an important document for the history of Anglo-Norman and English versification.

TEXT

F. 2 a Kenbelin out deus fiz, Wider, l'ain neoz,
Et Arviragun le puis neez.
Dis anz fu Rois, et puis finast,
Et Wider, sun fiz, heritast.
5 Del amour as Romains oil n'out cure,
Ne ~~ne~~ lour volt faire nule dreiture;
D'Engleterre lour deseisie,
Et tote lour treud entollie.

10 CLAUDIUS mult sei dedaignast:
Emperere ert, sun chief jurast
Ke lour Treud restournerast,
Et Wider desheritast.
Par comune cunseille del sené
Ad tant chivalché et erree,
2 b 15 Et od grant oit qu'il assemblast,
Ke en Engleterre arivast;
Porte et terre prist a Porcestre.
Puis fu tiel jour ni vousist entre.
L'emperere ad Porcestre assis,
20 Mais pesanz out einz kel fu pris,
Car Wyder les ad socurud,
Ke vint od plus de mil escud,
Ensemble od lui Arviragus:
Nes pout suffrir Claudius.
25 L'emperere out od sei Hamoun,
Sun cunseiller et sun baroun.
Oil ad vout Wider cumbatre,
Romains ferir, Romains abatre:
Lurpensa sei qe fereit,
30 Coment occire le purreit.
Un des Bretuns ad mort troved.
Le corps ad pris et desarmed.
Des armes al Bretun s'armant,
Et as Bretuns s'entremellant.
35 Ensemble od les Bretuns alout,
Ensemble od les Bretuns parlout.
Hamon alast tant traversant,
Et tant arriere et tant avant,
Qe al Rei Wyder s'est acoustez,
40 Et joust li fu lied a lied.
A un trestourne ke li Roi fist
Traist Hamon l'espee, si le ocist.

ARVIRAGUS, qi la aparceut
Ke li Reis mort al terre jut,
45 Ceo fu li primers qil' trovast,
Mais mult petite sei arestast:

- L'ameure et la conusaunce
 Ad pris del Roi, sanz demorance.
 Priveement s'en est armez,
 50 Si frest sur sun destrer munter.
 8 a Dunc veisses chivalers poindre,
 Sovent tourner, sovent joindre,
 Et le signe le Roi crier,
 Et les Bretuns amonestier.
 55 Nuls home conustre nel' pont:
 Guidant ce ceo lyder li Rei fust.
 Li Romeins fuient a desrei,
 N'osent attendre sun cunrei.
 En deus meités les fist partir,
 60 Ne sei parreint entretenir.
 Un partie as nefs tournant,
 Et ci ainz tout entrer entrast.
 Claudius est od ses turnez,
 Et as nefs s'en est entrez.
 65 Al bois turnast l'autre partie
 Ki ne poeint turner a la Navye.
 8 b Ensemble od ceus Hamon s'en fuie,
 Et Arviragus le pursue.
 Tant ont de bois ce plaine corud
 70 Ce a un port as nefs sunt venu.
 De sun chival Hamon descendeit,
 En un Neie entrer voleit;
 Arviragus l'ad ounceud,
 Ke li severast le chief du bus.
 75 ARVIRAGUS out Hamon mort,
 Le coros lessast gisant al port.
 En deventirs ce ceo avint
 Claudius al terre revint;
 Totes ces nefs ad rassemblez,
 80 Et a Porcestre retourniez.
 Les murs ad freiz et dep(ese)iez,
 Et totes les hommes exilez.
 Kant il out abatua Porcestre,
 Od quankil sont vin a l'Incestre;
 85 Arviragus mist dedenz
 Od tot le plus de ces parenz.
 Arviragus, ci esteit pruz,
 De la Cité ert fors isuz,
 Cunreis fist de ces chivalers,
 90 Et de deus parz mist ses archiers.
 Ja esteient al assembler,
 Et al lancier, et al jetter,
 Quant li sage home et li veillard
 Sei sunt trové a une part:
 95 La perde crocient de lour,
 Si requistrent l'Empereour
 Par demander c'li feroit,
 Si pais ou bataille voleit;
 Et il respundi boneement

- 100 Ke de la bataille n'out il talent,
Ainz volt la pees et volt l'onur,
(N) e mais ce Rome ait l'onur:
De nul altre gaine ad eüre
Ne mes ce Rome oit sa honure.
- 3 a 105 Arviragun en honorast,
Une feile ad ce li darrast
S'il volt soul sie homme devenir
Et de Rome sun fee tenir.
Arviragus l'ad graunté,
- 110 Si sei sunt entriels acoté.
En Wincestre s'en herbergierent,
Amis furent, si s'entre acordierent.
Claudius out li Roi enbrazé,
Par grant amour l'ad boisee.
- 115 D'iloez ont a Rome envoie
Cil ei en sunt appareillez
Par Genuis faire amener
Ke Claudius deveroit loner.
Entre tant conquist Orkenie
- 120 Par Arviragun et sa oye.
Li messenger lur vel tindrent,
Et al entrant esté revindrent,
Si'n amenerent Genuis,
Gent de corps, beal de vis.
- 3 b 125 A la meschine marier
Et a lour covenant fermer,
Furent li baron de la terre
Entre Gales et Engleterre,
Sur Saverne, en un valce
- 130 Ke mult art riche et esacié.
Par cele pleit mettre en remembrance
Firent a li tiel honraunce
Ke une cité i funderent,
Et Gloucestre l'apellèrent.
- 135 Quant Genuis fu marié,
A cels noeces fu coronee;
Enpres les noeces fu la summe
Ke Claudius alast a Rome.
- 140 ARVIRAGUS puis sun vivant
Tint as Romains sun covenant
Par l'amitee de la Reine.
Ke nez esteit de lur urino.
Marius, sun filz de mulier,
- 145 Out puis le regne a justiser.
Cil vesqui bien longement.
Et apres sun defineement
Regnast Coil, ce fu sis fiz.
Od les Romeins fu cil muriz; (*)
- 150 Les Lais Romeins out aprise,
Et sens et arz de plusurs guise.
Coil sei cuntint mult noblement,
Mult bele fu sa finement.

(*) Capital N in ms.

Apres Joil fu sis fiz Reis:
 Lucas out noun, mult fu curteis,
 155 Et mult fu de grant honesté;
 Par li creut saint Cristienté
 En Engleterre primerement.
 Si vous dirrai cum faitement
 Parler oist de Jhesu crist,
 160 Et des miracles ce il fist.
 Al Apostoille envoiast,
 4 a Ducelement li requerast
 Envoier lui qe li baptiserast,
 Et el la ley li enseignant.
 165 Quant cec oi li apostolis,
 A dieu rendi graces et gloirs:
 Al rei envoiast liuvan
 Et un oech compaignun Gafan.
 Al rei vindrent, si le baptiserent,
 170 Et la ley dieu li enseignerent.
 Cheres la Roi fu la meisné
 Et sa gent tot baptisé.

 Li deus Evesques prechoient,
 Et par les contrées aloient
 175 Par le Reiz et par sun otreiz,
 Li cum custume oit et droiz.
 Cil firent establir Evesques
 Et de sur ceo arcevesques.
 4 b Les temples ou li dieu estoient
 180 Ou li home paynym creient,
 Ont sanctifiez et mondez
 Et al dieu servir consacrez.

 L'UY li Reis se fist mult lied
 Qe li pueple vist baptised.
 185 Meintglise de ces terres feofast,
 Et grant demeines lour donast.
 Volunters amiceu servy,
 En pees regnast, et en oes feny.
 Li cors a Gloucestre jut;
 190 Mais de dix Cent cinkant anz et sis morust
 Puis qe dieu Incarnacoun
 Priet our nostre salvacion.
 Li terme de sun moriant
 Tout li Reis femme ne enfant,
 195 ne procheine de sun parenté
 Ri tenir pout l'herité.
 Quant as Romeins vint a saver
 Qe mortesteit Lucius sanz air,
 Deus legions appareillerent
 200 Et en Bretaigne les envoierent;
 Et un senatour Bever
 Par la terre a lour oes gardier.

- Sever vint od deus Legions,
 Mais mult trovast Bretuns feluns,
 205 Et nekedent tant guereiaist,
 Et tant prazist et tant donast
 Ke un partie a lui sumist
 Par ki plus des autres cunquist.
 Puis ont Astlepiadoc coroné,
 210 Et a lour Rei l'ont sacré.
 Issi tindrent Bretaine a force
 Les Romeins od lour afforce.
 Coel, uns Quiens de Gloucestre,
 Out dedeigne de lour entre.
 215 Cil esteit de grant parage,
 Et mult esteit de fier corage.
 Od Astlapiadoc gueroiaist;
 Tant creut la guere, et tant muntast
 5 a Coel en bataille, si le venquist,
 220 Le Roi occist, l'onur seist.
 Od le branc tiel coupe li dona
 Ke juscal dentz le branc coilla.
 Qi k'en peisast, ne ki fu bel,
 D'Engleterre fu Reis Coel.
 225 Eleine la Reine un feil out
 Ke mult de arte et de clergie solt:
 Eir le Rei soul estre devoit,
 Car fiz no feille autre n'aveit.
 Mult la fist li Reis bien aprendre,
 230 Et mult i fist mestres entendre,
 Pur ceo qant li Reist morust,
 Le Regne enpres tenir sust.
- DE Rome un baron remueit,
 5 b Costans out noun, mult l'em preiseit.
 235 Espaigne aveit aneis cunquis
 Et suz l'Empire as Romeins mis.
 Kant cil arivast en Bretaine
 Mult out tele gent en sa compaignie,
 Cremuz fu, et sa gent cremu.
 240 Coil, qe oist sa venu,
 Cuntre li meller ni oast;
 De grant pris ert, mult le doutast.
 Ses messagiers li ad tramise,
 Si li ad offert et pramise
 245 Ke Bretaine de li tendrad
 Et le treud nomé rendrad.
 Costans li ad bien otreied,
 Si ont entr'els pris amistied.
- ENPRES ceo ert un mois passez,
 250 En le secunde esteit entrez,
 Coel out mal, si enfermast,
 Et as chief de set jours deviaist;

- Et Costans prist sa foille Eleine,
 Si tint Bretaigne en son deméine.
 255 Ambe deus se firent coroner
 A Londres, devant l'autier.
 Un fiz ont entr'eis desiré,
 Et dieux lour ad un fiz doné;
 Contentin out noun, mult l'amerent,
 260 Et de bien nukir sei peinerent.
 Unze anz petite plus aveit,
 Mult amendout et mult cresceit,
 Quant Costans chaist en langour.
 Ne pout par mire aver retour:
 265 Ceo fu la fin, morir l'estoet.
 Costantin amendast et creut;
 Li baron l'ont levé al Rei.
 Et l'amerent par droit fei.
 Les Bretuns l'amast par sa mer,
 270 Et ceus de Rome par sun pier.
 A Rome ert a oel jour Maxence,
 Cil fu de cointe eloquence.
 6 a Emperer mult orgueilleuse,
 Mult fiel et mult malicieuse.
 275 Les honors de Rome pastast,
 Et lour dignité abeistast.
 Les barons ni volent a Rome meindre,
 A Costantin alerent pleindre.
 D'alier a Rome cil apriamast,
 280 Archiers et chivalers amenast.
 Treis uncles q' sa mere aveit,
 E'els mult amout et croeit,
 Menast a Rome pur chierté.
 Si's mist en ordre del sené.
 285 Li uns aveit noun Leonyn,
 Le mene Trahern, li terce Marin.
 Dunt fu Contentin Empereire,
 Et Eleine, sa bone More,
 En Jerusalem trespasast,
 290 Fouz les villes jues assemblast:
 Si fu par ly la croice trovee
 Ke lunge aveit esté celee.
 Al uncle Eleine, Lyonin,
 Donast l'un femme de halt lin.
 295 Un soul fiz urent, le norirent;
 Maxicien nomen le firent.
- CEUS de Bretaigne garder durent,
 Ke par Costantin remis furent,
 Octaves les prist, sis decolant;
 300 Roi se fist, si sei coronast.
 Les provoitz occist et les cunotes,
 Et les baillifs, et les viscuntes.
 Et Costantin a Rome estoit,
 A greniours choses attendoit.
 305 Un uncle Eleine i aveit,

- Trahern out noun, mult s'afioit,
Ki Ten Engleterre deliverast,
Et deus legions i amenast.
Trahern a Porcestre tournast,
310 Deus jours entiers i sojournast,
Puis li fu la cité rendu,
Ne pout mi estre plus tenu.
A Wincestre d'illoec alast,
Par force prendre la quidast;
315 Mais Octaves li vint devant,
Ki n'alast mie attargeant.
En la champe qe out noun Messure
Fu la bataille entr'els mult dure;
Mais li Bretun greindre force urent,
320 Et li Romeine sufrer nel' purent.
As portz les estoet repairer,
Et Trahern fist ses nefz chargier.
Tant alast par la mere siglant,
Et tant alast avironant,
325 Ke en Escoce vint al rivage,
Grant mal i fist et grant damage.
Totes les viles ad robbez,
Et les richeces assembler.
Octaves oist renoveler,
7a 330 Et pur veire l'em prist a cunter
Ke Trahern Escoce gastout.
Aveir ne tresor n'i lessout.
Cel part s'en vint od grant ont,
Meint chivaler i amenout;
335 Mais Trahern pas n'i s'en fui,
Ainz vint cuntre li, si le venqui;
Et Octaves s'en alout fuiant,
En Norweye ale querant
Al Rei Comperd, q'le socurust
340 Cuntre Trahern se il pust.
Iriveement out priez
Touz ses amis q'il out lessez
K'ills lour puer s'entremeisent,
Et pur li Trahern occisent.
345 Tot est Trahern asseurez,
Et Reis esteit par tot clamez.
Un jour ert de Lundres muz,
Mais sis eirs esteit trop seuz:
Par my un vales trespasssout,
350 Tote a seur, rien ne dotout,
Kant uns ouiens de un agait sailli,
Qe pur Octaves l'out hahi;
Chivalers out od sei mult bones,
Trahern ocist entre les soens.
355 Dunc fist Octaves revenir
Et de Bretaigne le fist seisir.
N'i ad une Romeine lessez
K'il n'aât ocis et detrenchiez.

- 360 Longes ad puis en pees tenud,
 Et longes ad en pees vascud.
 Kant il out bien sun temps usé,
 Et sun aage trespasé,
 Purpensa sei q'il ferreit,
 A ki sun regne guerpereit.
 365 Un feille aveit, s'il vounist
 Ke le regne enpres li tenist;
 A ses amis en ad parlé,
 Et ascuns d'els li ont loié
 Ke uns des nobles Romeins mandast,
 370 Sa feille od l'onur li donast.
 Tiels i out qe Conan amerent,
 Neveu le Roi, si le loierent
 Ke Conan del tote heritast,
 Et sa feille aliours mariast.
 375 UN noble conte aveit iloc,
 De Cornewaille, Caradoc.
 Cil dit qe ja n'otriereit,
 Ne ja al Roi ne loiereit
 Ke Conan del regne heritast, —
 380 Car puis apres l'en peisorast—
 Ne ke sun eire face de Conan,
 Mais enveit pur Maximian,
 Ke a Rome ert, fiz Lyonyn,
 Cosin Eleine et Costentin.
 385 Li Reis se tint a ceo cunseil,
 Et Caradoc li Conte leil

 390(cement).....
(et dunt al veneit)
 (Cum aveit noun et qe quereit)
 Maximian mult enjoie
 Del maundement q'il oie.
 395 Al Rei vint, q' l'aveit mandé maundé,
 Et li Reis l'ad mult honoré.
 Sa feille a femme li donast,
 Et de Bretaigne l'exitast.
 Conan sis nece fu retourner,
 400 Et ad Escoce ajoustez;
 Sun uncle et sa gent defiaist,
 Et Maximian gueroiaist.
 Maximian sei defendie,
 Ke li Rei out mie disselie;
 405 Et par maintefoiz i perdi,
 Et par maintefoiz le vanqui:
 Issi avint bien par tiel heure
 Ke tiels perte qe puis socure.
 A la parfin les assemblerent
 410 Li sage homme, sis acordierent;

1 a

1 b

Et Maximian li pramist
Riche home a faire, et si le fist.

- 415 EN treis anz tresurs aunast,
Et grant aveirs, si s'en vantast
Ne vers France mere passerait,
Et as fanceis sei cumbatereit,
Et les Romeines guerereit
Pur Valentin et Gracien q'il haet,
420 Qe cunte li Rome tenoient,
Ne cuncorde ne li querroient.
Maximian s'aparaleit,
Grant gent out, grant avers porteit,
Cum li home de grant bobance;
Vers occident, el chief de France,
425 Arivast en une cunte
Qe est Armoriche apellé.
Humbaus, qe sire ert del pais,
Maundast sa gent et ses amis;
La terre lour vult deforcier,
430 Et de sun fee les volt chacier.
Mais li bretun furent plus fort,
Ki de ses hommes ont mainte mort:
Ne sei purrent pas demorer,
Lur Ducs fu mort, o'il vont fuir.
435 "Sire Conan, dit le Roi, ore tenez
Le pais qe ai cunquestez."
Conan ad le doun receud,
Et mult l'en ad graces rendud.
Issi fu la terre voidee
9 a 440 Et as Bretuns tote lessé.
Pur ceo Bretaigne minor l'unt nomé,
Pur Bretuns qi l'ont cunquesté.
Et Maximien, qi mult mult sout,
Et qe la terre poepler volt,
445 D'Engleterre fist amener
Cent mil vilaines a laborer,
Et trente mil chivalers
Pur le pais edifiers.
Dunc ad fait Conan coroner,
450 Et les forcelettes deliverer.
Ne volt pas sojourner aiant,
Vers France passast avant.
France cunquist, et Lorenge,
Et Treves fist chief de sun regne.
455 Dunc prist vers Rome sun chemin
Sur Gratien et Valentin;
Lumbardie et Rome cunquist,
L'un en chaceast, l'autre ocist.
9 b
460 Tot l'empire ad seisie,
N'i ad nule qe li cunte die.
A Dyanoth, un soen vassal,
Un Gentile home. et un leal.

- Aveit Engleterre deliveré
Et la Justice comandé.
465 Cil aveit un feille mult bel
Ki esté apellé Ursel.
- FRANCEIS, qe furent rebaudi,
Ont Conan de guere acoilli;
Mais Conan s'est bien difendud,
470 Unkes par els ne fu venceud.
Pur la terre meulz gaigner,
Pur meulz poepler, pur herbergier,
Et pur sa gent asseurer,
Volt as hommes femmes doner.
475 Ne lour volt pas doner franceis,
Ne pur eforce, ne pur richeces,
Ne pur linage entremeller,
Ne pur terres acomuner.
Pur ceo fist Dyanoth requere,
480 Qi aveit en garde Engleterre,
Ke sa feille li otreiast,
Ursel, se luy envoiast,
Et des feilles as vavaours
Ky n'avient uncore seignurs,
485 Li enveleit qank'il purreit,
Et il bien les marriereit.
Dyanoth ad sa feille otreied,
Et od grant richesses enveied.
Unze mil meschines ad assemblez,
490 Totes des gentils hommes nez.
En nefes a Londres mis furent,
Od ceus qe cundure les durent.
Aval Tamise sunt corud,
Et de si en la mere venud.
495 Lour avint un tempeste merveilleuse,
Et une nue mult pluviouse,
Ke le vent fist devant turner,
L'air vertir, le jour obscurer:
Unkes n'oistes tant sudeinement
500 Tempeste sourdre ne turment,
En mult poi de oure nefes traverser,
Et meinte nefes periler.
Ki dunc oist crier meschines,
Et enhaucier voices femines,
505 Mult par i out Nefes perilez.
Et meschines a doel neiez.
Li uns qi se eschapièrent
Entre paiens ariverent;
Occis furent, ou vendud,
510 Ou en servage retenud.
Dis mil des puceles preised
A Coléigne furent occisés;
Maint en ront en la mer trové
Malins et Melga, esgardé.

10 a

10 b

- 515 Walins esteit Rois de Hungrie,
Par mere alout od grant Navye;
Melga esteit de Cise saro,
Ki les meschines en fist ocire.
Les mariners q' les guient
520 A Walins et Melga disoient
Cum Engleter ert afeblie,
Kar meint bon chivaler en ert passé:
A Rome en ert partie alé,
Ke Maximian en out mené;
525 Conan en out grant partie,
Si est la terre desgarnie.
De la novele sunt li paiens les,
C' ils sunt tost par Escoce envaie:
Tot destruerent et exilent,
530 Unc home n' i esparnisent.
Enpres unt Humbre passé,
Tot le pleine pais ont gasté.
Mandé ont Bretuns pur Maximian,
Et il lour tramist Gracian,
535 Un chivaler mult socurable,
De deus legions Conestable.
Cil ad les Bretuns socuruz,
Et les paiens sunt dolerous.
D' Engleterre touz les jetta,
540 Et en Irlande les chacea.

- ENTRE tant vindrent li cosyn
Et li bon parent Valentin
Par Theodosien de Orient,
Un Rei de grant efforcement.
545 Maximian a force pristrent
En Aquilé, si le ocistrent.
Des Bretuns q' furent od lui
Sunt alkuns mort, alkuns fui,
Et Valentin r' ad ceo seisie
550 Qe Maximian li tolli.
Gratian ne fist nient plus,
Ke d' Engleterre out le desus.
Chivetaigne sei fist et Roi,
Si demenast mult grant noblei.
555 Kant Walins et Melga oierent
Ke Bretuns Roi de Gracian firent,
Assemblé ont les Colandais
Et les Norreis et les Daneis,
Et ceus d' Escoce et ceus d' Irlande,
560 Si pur pristrent Northumbrelande.
Humbre od lur genz passerent,
O Kastels et viles decertierent.
Li Breton virent la tristour
Et le desert faire de lour:
565 Al Senatour ont derechief
Mandé par home et par bref.

11 b

Li senatour soulement
 Les envoieit igneusement
 Un Legion des chivalers
 570 Ki mult furent pruz et fiers.
 Walins et Meiga oïl en jetterent
 Et en Escoce les echacierent;
 Plus de quinze mil en ont ocis,
 Ke des Norreis de de Daneis.
 575 Morter et pier ont auné,
 Un mure firent sur un fosse
 Entre Angleterre et Escoce.
 Quant il urent tote achevé
 Le mure d'il urent cumpasé,
 580 As grantz barons del pais
 Ont a Lundres parlement pris.

UN sage Romeine i fu ce parlant,
 Ke la parole avant mustrast.
 585 "Seignurs, dit-il, maint grant perte,
 Et maint grant perte ont suert
 Escuns de nos anceissours,
 Et nous ensement pur vos amours.
 Vous nous avez treud doné.
 Et nous l'avom bien achacié;
 590 Et nous l'avom un an eud,
 En deus anz apres l'avom perduu:
 Nostre treud nous revoie,
 Tot encontre geor le nous rendez.
 Meulz nous valdreit le treu guerpier
 595 Ke issi lunges deservir.
 Qui quoms venir tantes feiz:
 Petes le meulz ce vous puriez.
 Quant vous vos terres ne defendez,
 Malement autres conquerer:
 600 Petes grantz tours et chastels fors
 Sur les rivages et les pors;
 Maintenez bien vostre franchise;
 Si vous oïstez d'autri servise,
 Vous ferez bien vostre voile."
 605 A cele parole ont grant doel,
 Dunc ont pris lour cungré
 Et li Romein sei sunt alé;
 Et bien distrent al departir
 Ke jamais ne quident revenir.
 610 Grant fu la doel ke la fust
 Kant detenir ne les poust.

12 a

615 WALINS et Meiga ont oiez
 Les noveles par lour espies,
 Ke li Romein finalement
 Aveient pris departiement.
 Od les Pictiens et les Daneis,
 Od les Escoce, od les Norreis,

En Nozthumbrelant entrerent,
 Ardent, destruent et robbent.
 12 b 620 Desi k'al Mure n'ont rien lessez
 Qe tot n'aient exilled.
 Li Bretun ont le mure garnye,
 Et cils d'efors l'ount assailie.
 Dunc veises d'amparz
 625 Gavelocs lancier et darz.
 Li Bretun kes kerneus guerpirent
 Et qi ainz pout discendirent.
 Cils de fors sunt al mure manté,
 En plusurs lues l'ont effundré.
 630 Enpres l'ont tote aplanez,
 Fosse et mure esquassez,
 Chastels et viles ont purpris,
 Et des Bretuns ont meinz ocis.
 Partot alerent a baundon,
 635 N'i troverent difeccion.

 LY Eveskes s'entre asemblerent,
 Dolent furent, et mult doubterent
 Ke par cele gent aliene
 En perireit la lei cristienne.
 640 A Lundres esteit a icole tence
 Un Arceveske mult eloquence,
 Guincelins, de mult graunt clergie,
 Et si esteit de bone vie.
 Guincelin, cist bon Arceveskes,
 645 Par le cunseile de ces Eveskes,
 En Bretaigne minor trespasant
 Qe Conan des Bretuns poeplast.
 Aldrogen, qi l'onur teneit,
 Quart Reis apres Conan esteit.
 650 Li Arceveske tant errast
 Ke Aldrogen le Roi trovast.
 Li Reis le fist mult honurer,
 Car mult l'aveit oie loier.
 Demandeit li qe quereit,
 655 Ke de si longe a lui veneit.
 "Sire, d'outre mere su venu ces,
 Kar grant bosoigne me en chace.
 Sire, tu parler oie n'en aies
 Des grantz dolours et grantz plaies
 13 a 660 Ke Bretun ont sovent eud
 Puis qe li Reis Maximian fud,
 Ki l'onur qe tu tiens cunquist,
 Et qi Conan seignur en fist.
 Jadis solient li Bretun
 665 Conquere meinte Region:
 Ore ni poeint mi soulement
 La lour difendre d'autre gent.
 Nous n'avoms prince ne Rei,
 Et li vains sanz lei

670 Ont nostre terre si cunquis,
 Et la gent tot si suspris,
 Jamais, jeo crei, ne resurdrom
 Se d'autre part sucurs n'aiom.
 Bosoigne avom, ore nous succure,,
 675 Si t'ert turné a grant honur."

13 b

ALDROGEN, q1 mult fu mult pitouse,
 Devint tote tristes et plurouse.
 "Si jeo, dist-il, vous puis valer,
 Jeo ne vous faudrai a mun power.
 680 Costentin, mun frere, en menerez,
 Et Conestable li ferez.
 Deus mil armez li livorai
 Des plus priesés qe jeo averai."
 Dunc ad Costantin demandé,
 685 Al Arcevesqe l'ad deliverée.
 Kant Guincelins l'esgardast,
 Levast la destre, si's seignast;
 Puis en ad dit: "Cristus regnat,
 Cristus vincit et imparat."
 690 Od mult riche appareillement
 Les mist as nefes des qe out vent;
 Et Aldrogen meismes od els alast
 Se il pust et il osast,
 Mais il aveit guere as francois.
 695 Costentin vint a Toteneis,
 Vers Lundres tindrent lour eir,
 De touz parz Bretuns feseint mander -
 Ke vous feroie-jeo longe pleit?
 Tant ont erré et tant fait
 700 Ke la malvais gent ont vencu
 Qi la terre aveit cunfundu.

PUIS tindrent conseil a Circestre,
 Tot li baron i durent estre.
 Costentin ont al Rei eslit
 705 sanz cuntredit et sanz respit,
 L'ont a grant joi coroné,
 Si l'ont fait lour avowé.
 Enpres li ont femme doné
 Ke des gentils Romeins ert né.
 710 Treis valetz out, et li plus granz
 En fist li Roi apeler Costanz.
 A Wineestre le fist nurir,
 Et là le fist Moigne devenir.

14 a

Enpres fu nez Aurelius,
 715 Sis surnons fu Ambrosius;
 Derainenement Uter nasqui,
 Ceo fu cil qe plus venqui.
 Si Costantin longes regnast,
 Tote la terre en amendast,
 720 Mais trop morust hastivement:
 Duze ans remout l'ant...

- Un des Pictiens out en sa meison,
Un traître, un mal felun.
Cil le menast en un vergier
725 Cum c'il le voustist cunseiller,
S'espé out trait, si le ferrî,
Le Roi occist, si s'en fui.
Cil de la terre s'assemblerent;
Roi voudrent faire, s'il douterent
14 b 730 De quele des valetz Roi fereint,
Petit erent, et poi savoient.
Costanz li ainz nez, qî esteit meire,
N'osoient del habite attraire.
Un des deus aveient choisie,
735 Qant Vortiger avant saillie:
Païen fu, et en Gales maneit,
Riches home ert. et Quiens esteit.
Al parlement fu cil venu,
De lour dit fu tote esmeu.
740 "Ke aiez-vous, dit-il, tant dotant?
Fetez Rei del moigne Costant.
Dreitz heir est; tolum l'abite,
Car li altre sunt trop petite."
Orible chose lour semblout,
745 Mais Vortiger, qî mal pensout,
A Wincestre est venu poignant,
Tant alast Costans demandant
Ke par le cungied del Priour
Parlast a lui al parlour.
750 "COSTANS, dist-il, morz est tis pers,
Remis est la terre a tes frers.
Mais tu deis heritablement
La regne tenir primerement."
Et Costans li ad tot graunté:
755 "Fetes, Sire, tun volunté."
Et Vortiger semres le prist,
Et fora del Abbeie le menist.
A Lundres l'ad d'illoec mené,
N'i out guers roeple auné.
760 Illoec Costans la corone receut,
L'ordre guerpi qe tenir dust.
Vortiger, qe traître fu,
Al Roi Costans est venu.
"Sire, dit-il, jeo sai de veir,
765 Et jeo te dei faire saveir,
Qe assemblé sunt li Danois
Et de Norweie li Norreis,
C'ils volent en ceo pais entrer,
Et tes chastels prendre et gastier.
15 a 770 Face garnir et garder tes Tours:
Grant pover i ad des traitours,
Si t'estoet tes chastels liverer
A cels qî sacent bien gardier.
- Amis, dit li Rois, beaus amis,

- 775 Jeo su tote en tun cunseile remis.
 Prenge ma terre tote a ta garde,
 Qe nuls n'i tolle, ne riens n'i arde.
 Pren mes Gitez, pren mes aveirs,
 Pren mes tresors, pren mes maners.
- 780 - Sire, dist-il, si vous pleiseit,
 Mun loos et mun cunseile serreit
 Ke tu envoies pur chivalers
 Des Pictiens, des Escoces a souldiers,
 Ke od tel seient en ta court:
- 15 b 785 Quele part vostre guere court,
 Pictiens purrez bien envoier
 La ou tu averas mestier.
 - Fai, dist Li Reis, a tun plaisir:
 Tant cum tu vols en face venir."
- 790 KANT Vortiger out tot seisie,
 Et le tresor tote recuillie,
 Des Pictiens mandast tant cum il plout,
 Et cil vindrent si cum il volt.
 Vortiger mult les honurast,
- 795 Bien les peust, bien les amast.
 Tant lour ad Vortiger doné,
 Et tant ad chascun honoré,
 N'i out un soul q'ne deist, (*)
 Oiant qe cil le vousist,
- 800 Ke Vortiger ert plus curteis
 Et mult valeit meuz qe li Reis.
 Hah fu digne d'aver l'onur
 Ke li Reis ad, ou greinour.
 Vortiger s'en glorifiout,
- 805 Et puis plus les honerout.
 Un jour les out enbevered,
 Et touz les out salued.
 "Mult vous aime, dit-il, chivalers,
 Et servi vous ai volunters.
- 810 Poi ai rentes en ceste terre:
 Aliours m'estoet plus aler quere.
 En le Rei servise ai mie m'entent,
 Si n'ai pas de li tant de rent
 Dunt jeo tienge honourement -
- 815 Quarante serjanz soulement,
 Si jeo conquere al repairez:
 Ore m'en vois a vos cungied."
 Vortiger aiant s'en turnast,
 Faus fu, et fraudement parlast.
- 820 Li Pictiens dient: "Qe ferom
 Si nous ceste bon seigneur perdum?
 Cest fol Rei occiom,
 Et Wortiger al Rei levom."
 Aiant sunt en la chambre entré,
- 16 a 825 Le Roi ont pris et decolé,
 Le chief li ont del bus severez.

A Vortiger l'ont presentez.
Cil conust le chief sun Seignour,
Semblant ad fait de graunt tristour.
830 Pur sa felonie celer
Fist les Lundreis assembler,
Les traitres fist touz decoler,
N'i lessast une vifs eschapier.

VORTIGER out les fermeretz,
835 Les chastels et les citez.
Reis se fist, mult fu orgoilouse,
Mais de deus chose fu anguisouse:
16b Del un part qi le gueroient
Li Pictiens qe mult le manacent,
840 D'autre part mult sei grevout
Ke tote gent li destinout
Qe li deus frere armes aveient,
Et a brefe terme revendroient,
Et les baron les recevoirient,
845 Et lour fee de els tendroient;
Costans lur frere vengierent
Car gent merveilleuse amenerent:
Assez ert qi duneit noveles.
Entre tant vindrent treis vassels
850 A un porte en Kent ariverent,
Ki gent estrange aportierent,
Od beaus vâaires, od grantz corps:
Lour sire fu Hengist et Hors,
Dieu frere de grant estature
855 Et d'un estrange parlure.
A Vortiger, qe a icel jour,
Ki ert a Cantorbrie a sojour,
Fust tost la novele cunctee
Ke estrange gent d'autre regné
860 Esteient arivés, treis nâez
Mult belement atirez.
Li Reis rovast qe cil fuserent,
Si pees ou guere queroient:
"Alez tost, si les amenez."
865 Li barons sunt al terre hastez,
Devant le Roi sunt venu,
Gentement li ont salu.
Li Roi regardast les deus freres,
As corps bien fait et faces clers:
870 "De quele terre, dit li Roi, venez,
Ou fustes neez, et qe querrez"
Hengist, qe Maire et ainz nez fu,,
Pur touz ensemble ad respundud:

"DE Saxson, dist-il, venimes,
875 Là fuums nez, et là manimes.
Si tu vols oir l'enchesun
Ke nous par ceste mere querum,
17 a Jeo t'en dirai la verité

- Si nous eioms ta seureté.
 880 - Dy, dit li Rois, ta reison tot,
 Ja mar de nuls n'averes dout.
 - Beau Reis, dit Hengist, gentil sire,
 Ne sai si unkes l'oïs dire:
 Nostre terre est de gent naie
 885 Plus habundable et plentive
 Qe nul altre qe vous savez,,
 Ne dunt vous ja oir purrez.
 Nos gentz merveilles multiplient,
 Et li enfant trope fructifient;
 890 Trop i ad femmes et trop hommes,
 Ceo puis nous peïser qe oi sumes.
 Qant nostre gent est tant creue
 Et la terre en est trop vestu,
 Li princes a ki les terres sunt
 17 b 895 Totes le mures assembler fënt
 Ki de vint anz sunt ou de plus,
 Si cum custume est et us:
 Tot li meliour et li plus fort
 Sunt mis fors del pais par sort.
 900 Si vont par autres Regions
 Pur quere terres et mansions.
 Pur le sorte qe sur nous chai
 Avoms nostre pais guerpi,
 Et Mercurius nous governast,
 905 Un dieux qï nous acunduast."
- KANT li Rois li oïast nomer
 Le dieu q'ils ont a gouverner,
 Demandast li qel dieu aveit,
 Et en ~~qel~~ quele dieu sa gent creeit.
 910 "Nous avoms, dit-il, plusurs dieux
 A ki nous devons faire autiers:
 Ceo est Phebus et Saturnus,
 Jubiter et Mercurius.
 - Malement, dit li Roi, creez,
 915 Et malvais damideu avez.
 Ceo poise moi, et nekedent
 Bele m'est de vostre avenement.
 Vaillant homes et fortz resemblez,
 Et si vous servir me volez,
 920 Touz ensemble vous retendrai,
 Et riches homes vous ferai."
 Et cil ont le Roi pramis
 De li servir a sun devis.
- NE demorast pas longement
 925 Ke li Piotiens efforcement
 En la terre le Roi entrerent,
 Ardent, destruent et robberent.
 Kant le Humbre durent passer,
 Li Reis, qe en oïst parler,
 Alu t ene entere...

- Od ses Seissons, od ces Bretuns.
 Dunc veises bataille dure,
 Mult i out grant discumfiture.
 Par Hengist et par sun adjutoire
 935 En out Vertiger la victoire.
 Li Roi a Hengist dona maners
 En Lindeseye, et bones aveirs.
 Hengist sout bien le Roi gloser
 En guise du fals losengier.
 940 Un jour trovast le Roi haitez,
 Si l'ad a cunseile areisonnez.
 "Tu m'as, dit il, mult honurez,
 Et assez m'as del toen donez;
 Mais j'ai assez aparceud,
 945 Asez oi, et assez veud
 Qe tu n'en as Baron qi te aime:
 Chescun te heet, chescun te pleine.
 Ne sai de quels enfanz parloient,
 Ke de tun Realme l'onur te tollerent. (*)
 950 Jusc'al poi de terme vendrunt,
 Et ceste terre toi tollerunt.
 Pur ceo m'en pense de toi aider,
 Si voil en ma terre enveier
 Pur ma femme, pur mes enfanz.
 955 Et pur altres apurtenanz.
 Jeo t'ai ja grant piece servy,
 Si ai pur toi maint enemy.
 Ne puis par nuit estre a seur
 Hors de chastel ne hors de mur.
 960 Pur ceo, sire si toi pleiseit,
 Tun pris et tun grant preud serreit
 Qe tu mei donase Citez,
 Ou Chastelé ou fermetez
 Ou jeo, sire, me puis guerir
 965 Et a seur par nuit dormir.

 - PUR ta gent, dit li Rois, envele:
 Bele les reveive, bel les cunrele.
 - Sire, dit Hengist, grantez a moi,
 A un des maners qe jeo sai,
 970 Un recette clere et enforcier,
 Et tant de terre, plus ne requier
 Cum jeo purrai un cuire estendre,
 Et od le cuire entoure purprendre:
 U cuire de tor tant sullement,
 975 Si g'irrai plus aureszent."
 Vortiger li ad graunté
 Et Hengist li ad mercié.
 Sun messenger appareillant,
 Et pur ses parenz et femme envoiait.
 980 Un cuire de tor prist, si le fendi,

(*) Cf. pp. 115, 169, 240.

- 19 a Un coreie si estendie,
 Dunt un grant terre avironast,
 Bones overers prist, chastei fermast.
 Ceste noun "Suongcastre" li ad mis,
 985 En la langage de sun pais;
 "Chastei de coraie" en Romance,
 "Kass Karai" en Bretance.
- KIST Suongecastre fu tot fermez.
 De ceus qe Hengist out mandez
 990 Vindrent dis uit neifs chargiez
 Des chivalers et des meisnez.
 Sa feille li ont amené,
 Ki n'ert pas uncore marié.
 Rowen out noun, si ert puceal;
 995 A grant merveille ert gent et beal.
 19 b A un jour q'il out esgardé
 Ad Hengist li Roi enveié
 A venir od lui herbergier,
 Et de(du)ir et mangier,
 1000 Et pur veor sa novele gent,
 Et sun novele herbergement.
 Li Reis vint esgarlement,
 Ki volt estre priveement.
 Le chastei vist, l'overeine gardast;
 1005 Mult fu bien fait, mult le loiaist.
 Le jour manjurent, et tant burent
 Ke a eise tote s'en furent.
 Dunt est fors de la chambre lissuz
 Rowen, la meschine et bun vestuz.
 1010 Pleine coupe du vine portast,
 Devant le Roi s'agenulast.
 Mult humblement li enclinast,
 Et a sa lei le saluast:
 "Laverd, King, Wessaille!" ad dit.
 1015 Li Reis demandast et enquist,
 Ki le langage ne saveit,
 Qe la meschine li disoit.
 Cheredie respundi primers:
 Bretun ert, si ert bons latiners.
 1020 Ceo fu li primes des Bretuns
 Ki solt les langages as Saxeons.
 "Sire, Rowen, dit-il, t'ad salué,
 Et Seignur et Rei t'ad apellé.
 Custume est, sire, en lour pais,
 1025 Kant ami beivent entre amis;
 Dunc cil dist "Wessaille" q' doit beivre,
 Et "Drinchaile" q' doit recevoir.
 Dunc beit cil tote ou la meitez,
 Et pur joi, et pur amistied;
 1030 Al hanape recevoir et bailier
 Est custume d'entre baiser."

- 20 a Li Reis, si cüm cil l'ad aprie,
Dist "Drinchaille," et si surist.
Rowen beut, et puis li bailea,
1035 Et en baillant le Roi baisea.
Rowen esteit devant le Roi defublé,
Ki merveilleuse l'ad esgardé.
Tant l'ad li diables amové,
Ki mainte home ad a mal turné,
1040 D'amour et de rage le prist
De esposer le feile Hengist.
Sempres l'ad a Hengist rové,
Et Hengist l'ad mult tost granté.
Mais Hengist ad cunseilled
1045 Od sun frere, k'esteit sened,
Ye li Roi li doint delivrement:
20 b Si demande en druerie Pent.
Li Reis coveitnat la meschine,
Amé l'out, si la fist Reine.
1050 Le jour l'améat, si la out le seir,
Et Hengist prist Kent aveir.
- VORTIGER out Rowan esposé,
Mais mult l'ad il amé.
Treis fiz aveit de luy eud,
1055 Ki ja erent tote parcreud:
Li primer out noun vortimer,
Et puis Pascens et Katiger.
"Sire, dit Hengist al Rei,
Tu es partie haiez pur moi:
1060 Si tu vols assure regner,
Et ceus q' te haient grever,
Enveiez pur mun fiz Oota,
Et pur sun coevn Ebissa.
Vers Escoce lour donne terre,
1065 kar d'iloez vint totens ta guere.
- r'ai, dit li Roi, cum tu voudras:
Mandez touz ceus q' bones saveras."
Et Hengist sempres enveiaist,
Sun fiz et sun Neveud mandast,
1070 Et cils vindrent od treis cent neis,
N'i ad bone chivaler romes.
Tost furent si munté,
As cristiens entremellé,
Avizunc conustrez l'om (*)
1075 Ki ert cristien, ne ki noun.
As Bretuns ad mult anueez,
Et si ont al Rei dit et priez
Ke cele estrange gent ne oreie,
Et de sa terre les enveie.
1080 Li Reis lour dist ke nun ferast:
Bien les servent, mandé les ad. (*)
Dunc se sunt Bretun assemblé,
A Londres sunt tost alé.

(*) See p. 129. (*) les for le in ms; cf. p. 107.

- 21 a
 1085 Vortimer ont al Roi levée,
 L'un des treis fiz li Roi, l'einz nee.
 Cil ad les Saissos defied,
 Et de la terre les ad jetted.
 Vortiger, pur l'amour sa Mere,
 Tint od els, neSa volt lesser:
 1090 Vortimer tint od les Bretuns
 Cuntre sun pier et ses barons;
 Par quatre foiz sei cumbati,
 Et par quatre foiz les venqui.
 Kant li Saison virent qe ne garirent
 1095 Si la terre ne guerpisent,
 Tramis ont le Roi Vortiger
 Ke il pri sun fiz Vortimer
 qe aler les leist quitement,
 Sans faire puis d'empoiremont.
 1100 Endementirs cum le Roi alout,
 Et cel treud purchaceout,
 Seisson sunt en lour nefs entrez,
 Vent ont bon, si ont siglez.
 21 b
 1105 [Vent unt bon, fort unt siglé]
 A grant pour s'en eschapièrent,
 En lour cuntrés s'en realerent.

- OIEZ cum fait diablerie
 Par grant hange et par envie:
 Rowen la Reine, cum male marastre,
 1110 Fist emposoner sun filastre
 Vortimer, qe eal haelt,
 Pur Hengist qe chacié esteit.
 Dunc refu fait Vortiger Reis,
 Si cum out esté auncels.
 1115 Pur sa femme, qe li en priast,
 Pur Hengist en Seisson mandast;
 Ceo li mandast q'il repairast,
 Mais petite de gent amenast
 Ke li Bretun ne sei afrelassent,
 1120 Et de rechief sei remellassent.
 Hengist repairast volunters,
 Mais il amenast treis cent milliers
 D'omes armez - Bretuns cremeit,
 Si ferait el qe einz n'aveit.
 1125 Hengist, qe out le queor felun,
 Mandast al Rei par treisun
 Ke pees et treud lour donasent,
 Et entre tant a eux parlassent:
 Pees amient et pees voleint,
 1130 Cels retienent q'ils elirent.
 Bretun ont le treud doné.
 Et d'amparz fu afié.
 Ke se cremeiseit de treisoun?
 Del parlement ad mis un jour,
 1135 Et li-Rois mandast a Hengist

Ke esgarniement venist,
 Qe nule arme n'i eit porté
 Pur poor de mover mellee.

- 22 a 1140 ES granz plaignes de Salesbirie,
 Lez l'abbeye d'Aumesbirie,
 Vindrent de deus parz a ceo plai
 Le jour des Kalendes de May.
 Hengist out touz ses cumpaignuns
 Bien enseignez et bien somons
 1145 K'en leur chaucés couteals porassent
 Tiels q' d'amparz trenchacent;
 Kant ils as Bretuns parloient,
 Et tot entremellé seroient,
 "Nime ure soxes!" criereit,
 1150 Ke nul des Bretuns n'entendreit;
 Chescun dunc sun cotel preist
 Et sun procheine cumpoine ocest.
 Qant tuz furent al parlement
 Entremellé communement,
 1155 "Nime ure soxes!" escriast.
 Chescun dunc sun cotele sachast,
 Et chescun sun cumpaignunociast,
 Ke nuls ne les cuntredist:
 Par mi piz, parmi bouoles
 1160 Firent passer leur alemeles.

- 22 b ELDOFS, un Quiens de Gloucestre,
 Tint un grant pecl en sun poigne destre.
 Bien en ocist seisante et ois:
 Freuz ert li Quiens, et de grant pris.
 1165 A sun chival vint traversant,
 Q'il out mult bone et mult corant.
 A Gloucestre s'en fui,
 La cité et sa tour garni.
 Saxson ont le Roi pris,
 1170 En anels de fer li ont mis.
 Li Roi, pur faire sun raunceon,
 Et pur li deliverer de prisun,
 Leur otreiaest en fee Sussex
 Et tout Essex et Middlesce,
 1175 Pur ceo qe pres erent de Kent
 Ke Hengist out primerement:
 Vortiger trestot lur guerpie,
 Outre Saverne s'en fui;
 Longes en Gales s'en trepassa,
 1180 Illec fui et conversa.
 Lolé li ont si cunseillars
 Ke tlei tour face edifier
 Qe ja par force n'esteit pris,
 Ne par engine de home cuncois.

- 1185 Dunc fist eslire et fist gardier
 Leue covable a tour funder;
 Maceons quist, les meliours q'ils solt,
 Et fist overir al einz q'il pout.
 Cil ont comencied a overir,
- 1190 Pere et mortier a loer;
 Mais qant q'il ont le jour ovré
 Esteit al nuit al terre effundré.
 Qant li Reis sout at aparceut
 Ke sun overaigne autrement ne creut,
- 1195 Ses devins traist a cunseille:
 "Par foai! dit-il, jeo me merveille
 Ou cesteovre poet devenir.
 Ne la poet terre sustenir:
 Gardez et enquerez ceo qe deit,
 Et coment terre la tendreit."
 Cil ont deviné et sortie,
 Mais ni pout estre c'il s'en mentie:
 Si une home trover poet
 Ke sanz pier avere nez esteit,
- 1205 Occist le, le sano preist,
 Et od le mortier l'espaundist:
 Par cele purreint seur durer,
 Si purreint a seur overir.
 Dunc ad fait li Reis enveier
- 1210 Par tote Gales, et encerchier:
 Si ja tiels home esteit trovez,
 Ke devant li fust amenez.
 Turné s'en sunt li quereour,
 Par plusurs cuntrés plusur.
- 23 b 1215 Deus ki alerent un chemyn
 Vindrent ensemble a Kermedyn:
 Devant la cité, al entré,
 Avoit d'enfanz grant assemblé.
 Entre cels q'i juerent
- 1220 Out deus valetz ki s'en mellerent.
 Ceo fu Merlin et Dynabus,
 L'un vers l'autre ert irascuz.
 "Tes-tei! dist Dynabus, Merlin,
 Jeo su assez de plus halt lin
- 1225 Qe tu ni es, si tei repose:
 Ne seiez qe tu es malveis chose.
 Jeo su meez des Rois et de cuntes,
 Mais si tu tes parenz acuntes,
 Ja tun pere ni nomeras,
- 1230 Car tu ne sees, ne saveras."
 Cils q'i les enfanz escotoent,
 Ki tiel home querant aloient,
 Qant oierent le tenceon
 As veisins vindrent environ
- 1235 Pur enquere qe cil esteit
 Qe unc pier ni aveit;

- Et li veisin l'ont respundue
 Ke une pier ni out eue.
 Dunc sunt cil al provost alé,
 1240 De part le Roi li ont rové
 Ke Merlin, qe unkes n'out pier,
 Seit menez al Roi, et sa Mer.
 Li Provost nel' pout desneier,
 Ambedeus les fist al Roi mener.
 1245 Li Reis les receut bonement,
 Si parlast amiablement:
- "DAME, dit li Roi, ore conuse la veir:
 Ne puis, si par toi, veir saver.
 Ki engendra tun fiz Merlin?
 1250 La nonele tint le chief enclin.
 Kant eal out pensé un petit:
 24 a - Si Dieu, dist eal, mei hait,
 Unkes ne conuse ne ne vie
 Ki ceste valet engendrie.
 1255 Mais ceo sai, et de veir le sai,
 Et pur veir le regeherai:
 Qant jeo fu aukes grant nurrie,
 - Ne sai si fu fantesmerie, -
 Une chose venoit sovent
 1260 Ki mei beiserait estraitement;
 Cum home parler le oie,
 Et cum home le sentie.
 Od mei se couchast, si cunceu:
 Unks home puis ne conu."
 1265 Dunc fist li Reis venir Magant,
 Un clerc des lettres mult sachant;
 Si demandait qe estre poeit,
 Ceo ke la nonele li disoit.
 24 b "Sire Roi, trové avoms esrit
 1270 Ke unemaner d'esperit
 Est entre la lune et la terre:
 Qi volt de lour nature quere
 Icubi et Sucubi oie noun;
 Par tote l'air ont lur Regionn.
 1275 Cil pregnant humaine nature,
 Ceo cunceut bien lour figure:
 Mainte meschine ont desceue
 Et en tiel maner perjeue.
 Issi pout Merlin estre nez,
 1280 Et issi pout estre engendrez.
- REI, ceo dit Merlin, mandé m'as:
 Ke me vois, pur kei moi mandas?
 - Merlin, dit li Roi, ja orras
 Si tu vols, et tu l'orras:
 1285 Un Tour ai fait comencier,
 Et fait mettre pier et mortier.
 Mais qant ke l'um ad le jour fait

Enfondre en terre et dedenz veit.
 Ceo dient mi devineour
 1290 Qe ja ne achiverast ma tour
 Si tis sanc ne seit dedenz mis
 Pur ceo qe sanz pier nasquis.
 - Ja Dieu, ceo dit Merlin, ne place
 Qe par mun sanc tun tour en face:
 1295 Pur mentours les feral tenir
 Si tu les fas devant moi venir."
 Li Reis les ad fait demander,
 Si's fist a Merlin amener.
 Qant Merlin les out esgardez:
 1300 "Seignurs, dit-il, qe devinez?
 Dites qe deit, et dunt cil vient
 Ke ceo overeine ne se tient.
 Ditez q'i ad el fundement,
 Pur kei la tour cheet tant sovent;
 1305 Ditez al Rei le destourber,
 Puis ditez qe i ad mestier."
 Tote li devineour sei tournent,
 A Merlin rien dire ne saxeint.

25 a

"Syr Rei, dit Merlin, entent:
 1310 Desouz ta tour, el fundement,
 Ad un estano grant et parfonde
 Par ki ta Tour en terre funde.
 Fai, dit-il, cel estano mundier,
 Par ruseles l'ewe espourgier;
 1315 Al fonz ad deus draguns dormanz
 De souz un roche cave mult granz.
 Li uns des Dragons est tote blancs,
 Et li autre est rouge cum sancs."
 Li Roi fist genz laborer
 1320 Et le funce mundifier:
 Deu dragons sunt del funce saillie
 Et forement sei sunt envaie.
 Par grant fierté s'entresailerent,
 Si ke li baron tot les virent.
 1325 Bien les veises escoomer,
 Et des goules flambes jetter.
 Li Reis dejouste l'estano s'asist,
 Merlin priast qe li dist
 Ke li Dragon signifiout,
 1330 Qe par ire s'asemblout.
 Dunc, dit Merlin, les prophecies
 Ke vous avez, ceo crei, oiez,
 Des Reis qe a venir esteient,
 Ke la terre tenir deveient.
 1335 Li ad mult Reis loié Merlin,
 Mult le tint pur bone devin.
 Demandeit li qand il murreit,
 Et par qele mort il finereit,
 Car de sa fin ert en effrei.

25 b

- 1340 "Garde-~~te~~i, dit Merlin, garde-~~te~~i
 Del fiz al enfanz Contentin,
 Car par lour feu vendras al fin.
 D'Armoriche sunt ja meuz,
 Par Mer siglent par grant vertuz.
- 1345 De ceo te puis faire certaine,
 Ke a Toteneis vendrunt demeino.
 Deus encombrers as de deus pars,
 Ne sai de quels primes ~~te~~i garz:
 D'un part Saison te gueroient,
 1350 Ke volunters ~~te~~i destruerent;
 Del altre part vendrunt li eir
 Ki ceste regne volent aveir.
 Bretaigne volent desrainer
 Et lour frere Costans venger.
- 1355 Aurelius ~~primes~~ Reis primes serrad,
 Et par puison primes murrad.
 Uther, sis frere, Pendragun,
 Tendrad enpres la Region."
- 26 a
- 1360 MERLIN sa parole finast
 Et Wortiger d'iloec turnast,
 El demeane plus ne demorast.
 La flote as freres arivast
 En Dertemeue, a Toteneis,
 Od chivalers et od herneis.
- 1365 E vous Bretuns joieuse et lied,
 S'il sunt ore bien enforcied.
 Il sei sunt ensemble treit,
 De Aurelius ont Rei et Seignur fait.
 Vortiger, qi cel pleit oist,
- 1370 En Gales fu, si s'en garnist;
 A un chastel, - Conore out noun -
 Cil alast quere defencion.
 Lour barons ont li frere pris,
 Tant ont le Roi Vortiger quis
- 1375 X'en sun chastel l'ont assegied,
 Assied cil ont trait et lancied;
 Attreit ont fait bois al porte,
 Ke esteit barré mult fort.
 Si ont en l'atreit le feu mis
- 1380 Et li feus est en le chastel pris:
 Del chastel s'en prist en la Tour,
 Et es meisons qi sunt entour.
 Dunc veisés le chastel arder,
 Flambe voler, meisons chaier:
- 1385 Ars fu Vortiger et cil od lui
 Qe od lui urent pris refui.

- KANT li novels Reis out cunquis
 Et tourné a sei le pais,
 Hengist l'oist dire, mult le dotast,
 1390 Vers Escoce s'en trespasast.

- Li Reis, de journé en journée,
Ad cele part sa gent menée.
- 1395 Hengist sout qant li Reis veneit,
Qe sanz meller n'en partiseit.
- 1395 Cil ne volt plus atargier,
Ces cumpaignuns fist touz armer.
Cuntre Bretuns hastivement
Alast chivalcher celement:
- 1400 Desarmez les quidout trover,
Si les pensout desbarreter.
Mais Bretuns, qe paiens cremeit,
Jour et nuit armez esteient.
Qant li Reis sout q'ils veneient,
Et qe cumbatre sei voleient,
- 1405 Cuntre Hengist chivalche irrousement,
Treis cunreies ad fait de ceo gent.
Eis vous el champe venu Hengist,
Ki grant masse del champe purprist.
Ne firent pas grant demorer
- 1410 A la bataille comencier.
Dunc veissés vassals cumbatre,
Li fort les febles en abatre,
Escuz percir, hanstes fruisser,
Naferez chair, chaiz murir..
- 1415 Bretuns lour cunreies bun maintendirent,
Et li paiens le dos turnerent.
N'i poent l'estour sufrir:
Volent ou noun, lour estoet sortir.
- 27 a 1420 Qant Hengist vist les soens turner,
Les dos as coups abaundonner,
A Conigburne vint poignant:
Iloec quidast trover garant.
Mais li Rois a'alast pursuant,
Criant as soens; "Avant, avant!"
- 1425 Eldolf l'ad venu aprismer
An guise de hardi chivaler.
Mult l'en haïout, et bien deit,
Pur le mordre q'il feseit
En le pleine de Salesbire
- 1430 Qant les Bretuns en fist ocire.
Hengist atteint, si l'enbraceast,
Par vive force l'en menast.
Dunc fu Hengist bien justisé,
En cheines mis et lié;
- 1435 Au Roi Aurelie fu delivered,
Bhen fu destreit et bien garded.
Sis fiz qi ert el champe, Dota,
Et sis cosins Ebissa,
- 27 b 1430 A peine sei sunt eschapé
Et en Ewerwic sunt entré.
La Cité ont dedenz garnie
Od tant q'il urent de aye.

- LI Rois fu lied de ceo gloire
 Ke dieu li out doné la victoire.
- 1445 Dedenz Conigburne entrast,
 Treis jours entiers i sojournast.
 Entre tant as Bretuns parlast,
 Communement lour demandast
 Ke del felun Hengist fereit,
- 1450 Si le tendreit ou l'occierait.
 Eldolf salt sus, li gentil bier:
 "Sire, car le fetez decoler!
 - Fetez, dist li Roi, cum vous volez."
 Eldolf sailli, si l'out saisez,
- 1455 Fors de la vile Hengist amenast,
 S'espé trait, si le decolast.
 Li Rois se cuntint vivement,
 Ne sojournout pas lungement;
 A Ewerwic vint od grant ost,
- 1460 Ses enemis dedenz encolost.
 Octa, fitz Hengist, ert dedenz,
 Et partie de ces parenz.
 Cil vit qe nuls socours n'aveit,
 Ne diffendre ne sei purreit.
- 1465 De la Citez un piez issi
 Et tote si homme autresi.
 Octa, qi primer al Rei vint,
 Un fort cheine de fere tint;
 Devant le Roi s'est agenulez,
- 1470 En halt s'ad ses meines levez:
 "Sire, dit-il, merci, mercy!
 Trestouz nos dieux nous ont failli.
 Vencuz su, a ta merci vinc:
 Pren la cheine qi jeo tinc,
- 1475 Si feras de moi tun talent,
 Et de mes homes ensement."
 Li Reis fu de grant pité,
 Entour sei ad esgardé
 Saveir qe li baron diroient,
- 1480 Et coment l'em le cunseillarent.
 Eldadus, li bons ordiners,
 Parlast avant cum senez:
 "Bone est, dist-il, et fud et ert,
 Ke merci ait qe merci quert."
- 1485 Bretaigne, qe ert longe et lee.
 Par plusurs lées desherité,
 Fai-lour un parti liverer,
 Sis face errer et laborer,
 Sy viveront de lour gaignages:
- 1490 Mais primes en prenge bones oustages,
 Ke lealment tei serviront
 Et lealment sei cuntendrunt."

LI Reis terre lour otreiast,
 Cum li Evesqe li loiast,

- 1495 De jouste Escoce a gaigner,
Dunt s'alerent là herbergier.
Li Rois fu quinze jours en la vile;
Des gentz mandast, si tint cuncile.
Lour fuis et lur dreiz lur rendi
- 1500 Ke par les Paiens furent yolli.
Les Eglises de par la terre,
Ke destruit erent par guere,
Fist li Rois toutz restorer
A dieu servir a adourer.
- 1505 Puis est alé a Ambesbire,
Pur visiter le oimiter
Ou cil erent ensevelie
Ke as cuteaus furent murdrie:
Le leu voldreit enhaucier,
- 1510 Si fist bones overours mandor.
Temorius, un sage hom,
Arcevesque de Karliun,
Li rovast qe Merlin mandast
Et par sun cunseile en overast.
- 1515 Li Rois volt mult Merlin veer,
Et oir volt de soun savoir:
Pur li en Gales l'ad enveyé,
Qe mult l'en ad honoré.
Mult le priast, mult le requist,
- 1520 Qe l'enseignast et regeist
Cum si gent purrent overir
Ovreine qe pout longe durer,
Pur remembrer a tut dis
Le leue ou Bretuns furent ocis:
- 25 a 1525 "Beau Reis, creez a ma parole,
Fai ci aportier la carole
Qe Geanz fiant en Irlande,
Un merveilleuse ovre et grant,
Des peres en un cerne assis,
- 1530 Les uns sur les autres mis.
- MERLIN, dit li Rois en riant,
Des qe les peres peisent tant
Ke hom nes pout remuer,
Ki mei purreit ci portier?
- 1535 - Reis, dit Merlin, dunt ne sees-tu
Ke engine surmunte vertu?
Engine poet les peres mover,
Et par engine poet l'em aver."
Li Rois ad Uther ordeiné,
- 1540 Od quinze mil Barons armé,
Ki as Irreis se cumbatierent
Si les peres sei diffendient.
Merlin ensemble od els irreit,
Ki les peres enginereit.
- 1545 Qant Uther fu tot apresté,
En Irlande ad la Mer passé.

- GILLAMORUS, qi esteit Reis,
Mandast ses genz et ces Irreis.
Les Bretuns prist a manacier
1550 Et del pais les volt chacier.
Qant ils solt qe queroient,
Et pur peres venud estoient,
"Ja un, dit-ils, n'en averunt,
Ne ja un n'enporterunt."
1555 Sempres sei sunt entrevenud,
Et bien sei sunt entreferud.
Irreis n'erent pas bien armé,
De cumbatre n'erent acustumé:
Des Bretuns urent despitz,
1560 Mes Bretuns les ont descounfitz.
Li Reis Gillamorus alout fuiant,
De vile en vile prestournant.
Kant Bretun sei furent desarmé,
Et bien sei furent reposé,
1565 Merlin, qi ert en la cumpaigne,
Les menast en une muntaigne
Ou la carole esteit assis
As Geanz qi l'aveient cunquis.
Cils ont les peres esgardés,
1570 Assez les ont avironés.
"Seignurs, dit Merlin, asalez
Si par vertu qe vous avez
Purrez ces peres remuer,
Et si vous les purrez portier."
30 a 1575 Cils sunt as peres airez,
Derere, devant et de travers;
Bien ont enpointe et bun boté,
Et bien retrait et bun crolé:
Uno par force a la menour
1580 Ne purreint faire peindre un tour.
"Trahez-vous, dit Merlin, en sus:
Ja par force ne ferez plus.
Ore verrez engine et savoir
Mealz qe vertu de corps valer."
1585 Dunc alast avant, si s'estuet,
Entour gardast, le leve mut
Cum home qe fist oreisun -
Ne sai s'il fist cunjurisoun.
Dunc ad les Bretuns rapelez:
30 b 1590 "Venez, dit-il, avant venez.
Ore poez les peres baillier,
A vos nefs portier et chargier."
Si cum Merlin enseignast,
Si cum il dit et comandast,
1595 Ont li Bretun les peres pris,
As nefs portez et einz mis.
En Engleterre les amenerent,
A Ambesbirie les portierent.

1600 En la champaigne d'illoec en joustes;
 Le Roi i vint a Pentecouste.
 Ses Evesques et ses Abbez
 Et ces Barons ad touz mandez.
 Autre gent mult i asemblast;
 Feste tint, se se coronast,
 1605 Et Merlin les peres dreceast,
 En lour ordre les raloïast.
 Bretun les soleient en bretance
 Apeler "la carole as Geanz:"
 "Stonhenges" ad noun en engels,
 1610 "Pere pendues" en franceis.
 Qant la grant feste fu finé,
 La curte al Rei s'est departé.

PASCENS, un des fiz Vortiger,
 Pur poor de Aurelie et de Uther,
 1615 Gales et Bretaigne guerpie,
 Vers Alemeine s'en gui;
 Hommes purchaceat et Navye,
 Mais n'out mye grant cumpaignie.
 En Bretaigne Notht arivast,
 1620 Viles destruit, terres gastast;
 Mais longes estre n'i osast,
 Car li Reis vint, si l'en chaceast.
 Kant Pascens refu a la Mer,
 N'osast la dunt il vint turner:
 1625 Vers Irlande droit ad siglé,
 Bone vent out, et bone erré.
 Al Roi de la terre ad parlee,
 Tant li ad pramis et prié,
 Et tant ont ambedieu cunseilled,
 1630 Qe od li venir l'ont grantéed.
 Od tant de force cum aver purent
 Passerent Mer qant bon vent urent.
 En Gales sunt tuz arives,
 Et en Meneve sunt entré.
 1635 Li Reis Aurelie se giseit
 A Wincestre, si languiseit.
 Qant il out oïe de Pascent
 Et del Roi d'Irlande ensement,
 Uther sun frere i envoïast:
 1640 N'i pout aler, mult sei peisast.
 Uther ad mandé ses barons,
 Et tuz ses chivalers somons.
 En dementirs q'il s'apareïlast,
 Appas a Pascens parlast:
 1645 Païen ert, et de Saxons neez,
 Qi mult esteit enlopunez;
 De medicine se feseit sage,
 Si saveit parler meinte langage;

31 a

31 b

Feel esteit, et de mal fei.
 1650 "Pascens, dit-il, entende mei:

1655 TU as piecea le Roi haie -
 Ke me durras si jeo l'ocie?
 -Mil livres, dit-il, te durrat,
 Et jamais jour ne te fauldrat
 Si tu ta parèle as cumplis
 Qe li Reis seit par tel ocis.
 - Ne jeo, dit-il, plus ne demande."
 Issi firent lour covenant.

1660 Appas fu mult enginous,
 Et del argent mult coveitous.
 De drax monaile se vestie, (*)
 Corone fist halt, si se yundi.

1665 Cum Moigne rees et tunduz,
 Et cum Moigne revestud,
 Od cuntenance moniale
 Est aiez a la curt regale.
 Trichier fu, mire se fist,
 Al Rei parlast, si le pramist
 Ke a bref terme l'infereit seine
 1670 Se il le volt mettre en sa meine.
 Tastast le pèce, et wist l'orine,
 Tantost li mette en decline.

Li gentils Roi guarir voleit,
 Cum chescuns de nous voldreit:
 1675 N'aveit doute de treison,
 Es meins ceo mist a cel felon;
 Et cil li ad puisun doné
 De venime tot destrempré.

32 a 1680 Puis se fist chaudement coverir
 Et gisir en pees et dormir.
 Des qe li Rois fu eschaufez,
 Et li venime al corps mellez,
 Dieux, qe dolour! morir l'estoet.
 Mais qant il solt qe murir dust,
 1685 A ses homes dist, qe le gaitoent,
 Ausi veralement cum ils le amoient,
 Ke a Stonhenges sun cors portassent,
 Et iloeo dedenz s'enterrassent.
 Issi fu mort, issi finye,
 1690 Et li traitres s'en fuye.

UTHER fu en Gales entrez,
 A Meneve out Irreis trovez.
 Un esteille est dunc aparue,
 Et od plusurs gentz ert veue.
 1695 Comete out noun: signifio
 Muelement de Roi, solom clergie.
 Oler esteit merveillousement,
 Si jettout vii rai soulement.

(*) In ms Monalle.

- 1700 Uns feus q'i de cel raye lissait
 Figure de Dragoun feseit;
 De cele Dragon deus raies venoient,
 Ke par la gule fors se lissent:
 Li uns syr France s'estendeit,
 Et l'autre vers Irlande alout,
 1705 Et en set raies sei devisout.
 Uther forement sei merveillast,
 Et merveilleuse sei efrelast.
 Merlin ad pried q'il li die
 Ke ni fait signe signifie;
 1710 Et Merlin mult sei cuntriblast,
 Doel out en qeor, mote n'i sonast.
 Qant, sis espiriz repaizast,
 Mult fu dolent, et suspirast:
 "HE dieux! dit Merlin, cum grant dolurs,
 1715 Cum grant damage, cum grant plours
 Sunt avenud huy en Bretaigne!
 Perdu ont lur bone chivetaigne
 Mort est li Reis, li bons vassas,
 Q'i de dolurs et de grant mals
 1720 Ad sun torre deliveréd
 Et des meins as Paiens osté."
 Qant Uther oist de sun frer,
 Del bone Roi, qe fenist eer,
 Mult fu dolent, mult s'esmaiaast,
 1725 Mais Merlin mult se cunfortast:
 "Uther, dit-il, ne te maier -
 N'i ad del mort nul recoverer.
 Espleite ceo qe tu as quis,
 33 a Cumbate-tei od tes enemis:
 1730 La victoire demeine t'atent
 Del Roy d'Irlande et de Pascent."
 Qant Uther out escouté
 Cum Merlin l'out cunforté,
 La nuit fist ~~xxix~~ ses gentz reposer
 1735 Et par matin les fist armer.
 La Cité voudrent assaillir,
 Mais les Irreis les vist venir,
 Pristrent lur armes, cunreies firent,
 Et a cumbatre fors lissirent:
 1740 Fierement sei sunt cumbatu,
 Mais assez tost furent venou,
 Car Bretuns les occistrent,
 Et le Roi de Irlande ensement.
 Qant Uther out fenye sun afaire,
 33 b 1745 Vers Wincestre prist sun repaire,
 Le meulz od lui de sun barnage.
 En le chemyn encuntraast un message
 Ke li ad dit veralement
 Cum li Reis ert mort et coment,

- 1750 Et li Evesques, par grant cure,
Aveient fait sa sepulture
Dedenz la carole as Geanz,
Si cum il comanda a ses serjanz.
Uther se fist coroner
1755 A Wincestre cum fort justiser.
- OCTA, qe fiz Hengist esteit,
A ki li Reis doné aveit
Grantz terres et mansions,
A li et a ses cumpaignuns,
1760 Kant oit qe li Reis ert mortz
Ke mainteneit les grantz efforts,
Petit preisant le novel Rei,
Serement ne li deit, ne fei.
Sis cosins od li, Cosa,
1765 Et grant ost i assembla,
Vers Escoce de lunc, de lee,
Fuis sunt a Ewerwic allee,
La Cité entour ont assegé.
Uther oist le noveles,
1770 Grant ost assemble des juvenceles,
~~En~~ A Ewerwic vint tost errant,
Octa et Cosant asaillant.
Dunc veisses grantz tueiz
Et merveilleuse deglageiz,
1775 Ventres perrier, piz efoundrer,
Testes trencher; pié et poigne voler.
Octa et Cosa pris i furent,
34 a A Lundres les amenerent,
Et en la Tour furent posez,
1780 Et od cheines mult ferme liez.
Kant Uther issi fu vengez,
Par Northumbrelande esteit passez.
Kant vers Northt out fait sun affaire,
A Lundres dreit prist sun repaire;
1785 Et qant le jour de l'ask veneit,
Et il coroner se voleit,
Ducs et Cunotes de sun barnage
Somon de par bref et par message,
Et od leur femmes espousez,
1790 Et od lur meismés privez;
A Lundres seient a la feste,
Kar feste voleit tenir honeste.
Gorlois i vint, de Cornewaille,
Et sa femme i amena sanz faille.
- 34 b 1795 Al manger est assis li Reis,
Au chief de la sale, a un deois.
Li baron s'asistrent en tour,
Chescun en l'ordre de s'onour.
Liez Gorlois i sist Igerne sa femme :
1800 N'en out plus beal en tote la repne.

- Mult l'ad li Rois esgardee,
 S'amour ad vers li tourné.
 As countenanz et as enceinementz,
 Et as saluz et as presentz,
 1805 Aparceut bien li Quiens et s'out
 Qe li Roi sa mulier amout.
 De la table ou il sist sailli,
 Sa femme prist, si s'en fassi.
 Li Reis li ad enpres maundé;
 1810 Qant ne vint, si l'ad manacié.
 Gorlois en Cornewaille revertie,
 Deus chastels out, o'es bien garnie.
 Sa femme mist a Tintagelle,
 Castel esteit assis mult bel.
 1815 Li Reis apres li s'est hasté,
 Ses terres en ad ars et gasté.
 Ulfin, sun bon privee,
 Ad priveement appellé:
- 1820 "ULFIN, dit-il, cunseillez-moy,
 My cunseille est trestoet en tey.
 L'amour Igerne m'ad suspris,
 Tot m'ad vencud, tot m'ad cunquis.
 - Sire, ne vous sai cunseille doner,
 Mais fetes Merlin demander."
 1825 Li Reis, par le cunseille Ulfin,
 Fist maunder et venir Merlin.
 Li Rois l'ad sun bosoigne mustré,
 Et Merlin de aider l'ad otroié.
 35 a 1830 Merlin en fist le Roi munter,
 Tot sa colour en fist chaungier,
 Semblance de Gorlois aveit.
 A Tintagelle vindrent demaintenant.
 Cils q' la porte gardier durent
 1835 Quidrent le Gorlois od sa meiané furent:
 La porte overi, o' ils entrerent:
 Igerne i corust, si los saluerent.
 Eal quidout qe sun seignur i fust,
 Gentelement l'ad rescout.
 Li Reis od Igerne se jut,
 1840 Et Igerne la nuit cunseut
 Li bon Roi, li fort, li seur.
 Ke vous oiez nomer Arthur.
 Le gent le Roi surent mult tost
 Ke li Reis n'esteit mi en l'oost.
 35 b 1845 Servir le volent a gree:
 Un chastele ont assaillé
 Ou li Conte Gorlois esteit.
 L'asalt comencierent a grant espleit:
 Gorlois li conte i fu ocis,
 1850 Et li chastele fu sempres pris.

- Askuns qi d'eloc eschapièrent
A Tintagele nuntier alerent
Coment lour est mesavenud
De lour Seignur q'ils ont perdud.
1855 "Taisez! dit li Rois, n'est my isai:
Vifs su et sainz, dieu merci.
Cuntre le Roi la fors iisterai:
Pees querrai, si ma acorderai."
- 1860 AITANT s'est del chastele issuz,
Ses desiréz out tote euz.
Kant fors furent en lour chemin,
Li Reis et Ulfin et Merlin,
Al ost vindrent delivrement:
Asavoir li Rois voit coment
1865 Si li Quiens esteit ocis,
Et li chastele par force cunqua.
Asez fu qi l'ad cuntee
De l'un et del altre la verité.
A Tintagele s'est returnez,
1870 Cels del chastel ad apellez.
Li Reis, qi out Igerne amé,
Sanz essoigne l'ad esposee.
La nuit einz ont un fiz cuncee,
Et al terme out un fiz eue.
1875 "Arthur" out noun de sa bounté,
Dunt grant renoun ad puis esté.
Uther regnast bien longement
Sains et sauf et paissiblement.
36 a Ceus qi Octa et Cosa gardierent
1880 Pur doun del chartre les delivererent.
Quant cils furent en lour cuntrés
Et lour gent urent assemblés,
O'ils sunt en Northumbrelande entrez:
Le terre ont ars et gastez.
1885 Uther, qi malades esteit,
Et qi aider ne se poeit,
Pur sa terre et li diffendre
Liverast sur tóuz a Looth, sun gendre.
Octa et Cosa s'en orgoillierent,
1890 De Colgrin lour seignur firent;
Grant ost ont assemblé,
Vers Looth furent chivalché.
- 1895 OIEZ du home de grant fierté:
Uther n'i lessast pur sa formeté,
Portier ceo fist cum on biere,
Od chivals en un ~~lithre~~ litere.
A Verolam vint li Roi tot droit,
La ou Octa et Cosa esteit.
Cils de cūmbatre se aprestierent,
1900 Del Roi Uther dedeigne urent

- Ke en la char se cocheit,
 Ke guereier les voloit.
 Leur escheles ont ordeinez,
 Encuntre Looth sunt chivalchez.
 1905 Vencuz fu et ocois Octa
 Et sis bons cosins Cosa;
 Et Colgrin s'en est eschapé,
 Vers Escoce s'en est alee.
 Li Saxson, qi furent chacies,
 1910 Et Colgrin, leur avowez,
 Un tresun ont purpensé
 Dunt li Reis ert enposoiné::
 Homes ont esliz malfesanz,
 Ne vous sai dire qels ne kaunz;
 1915 Deners et terres les pramistrent.
 Al curt le Roi les tramistrent.
 Cil ont tant alé et venu
 K'il ont oye, q'il ont veu
 Ke li Reis eve froide useit,
 1920 Nul altre beivre ne usout.
 Cil ont la fontaigne envenimé,
 Puis sunt fort de la cite turné.
 Li Reis cochant, mult mal eisé,
 A beivre l'ewe ad demandé;
 1925 Del ewe beut, enpres emflast,
 Plaisist et verti, sezpres finast.
- KANT Uther li Roi fu ci finez,
 A Stonhenges fu aportez.
 Illec dedenz fu enterrez
 9930 Delez sun frere, lez a lez.
 Li Evescos s'entresamblarent
 Et li baron s'entreassemblerent:
 Arthur le fiz Uther maunderent,
 A Cioestre le coronerent.
 37 a 1935 Quant Arthur fu Reis novèlement.
 De sun gré fist un screement
 Ke ja Saxsons pais ne averunt
 Tant cum el regne od li serrant;
 Sun uncle et sun pers ont ocis,
 1940 Et troblé ont tot le pais.
 Colgrin les Saxsons meintenn,
 Grant oet cil assembla.
 Arthur, li pruz et cumbatant,
 Grant juvente assembla demaintenant:
 1945 Vers Northt li Roi chivalcha,
 Et Colgrin tost l'encuntra.
 Multz en chaist d'amparz,
 Od launces, od quareals et od darz.
 Mais descunfiz a la parfin
 37 b 1950 Si furent Saxsons et Colgrin.
 Colgrin fu mort, et me(int) milliers
 Des Saxsons pruz et legiers.

- KANT Arthur out sa terre assie
 Et partot eu bone justise,
 1955 Et tote sun regne out delivré
 De Saxons et lour aie,
 Gonovre prist, si la fist Reine,
 Un cointe et noble meschine;
 Beal esteit, curteisse et gent.
 1960 Et as nobles Romeins parent.
 Mult fu large et de bele parler:
 Arthur l'amast et la tint chier
 Mais entre eis deus n'urent nul oir,
 Ne ne purreint enfant avoir.
- 1965 ARTHUR, qant yver fu passé
 Et od le chaud revint esté,
 Et mer fu bele a navier,
 Sun Navye fist appareillier:
 En Irland, ceo dit, irreit,
 1970 Et tote Irlande conquerreit.
 N'i fist Arthur longe attent
 Maunder fist sa meliour juvent.
 Tant pancez furent en Irlande,
 Par la terre pristrent viande.
 1975 Gillamorus, Rois de la terre,
 Ne se volt purloigner:
 Encontre Arthur vint od sun aforce,
 Mais ne li valut sun aforce;
 Tot en cent fu descunfis
 1980 Et li Roi Gillamorus fu pris.
 Mais cil fist a Arthur homage,
 Si prist de lui sun heritage.
 38 a Tant Arthur out cunquis Irlande,
 Trespassez ert jusques Islande:
 1985 La terre prist tot et cunquist,
 Et e sci tote la sumist,
 Partot volt aver seignurie.
 Convals, q'ert Rois de Orkenie,
 Et Doldanyn, Roi de Collande,
 1990 Et Rumarec, Rei de Westmerlande,
 Urent tost le novele oie,
 Et chescun d'eis i out s'espie
 Ke Arthur sur ois passereit
 Et tot les Isles destruerait.
 1995 Chescun od sun ain degré
 Sont en Irlande a Arthur alé.
 De lour avoirs tant li portierent,
 38 b Tant li pramistrent et tant donerent,
 Pes firent, sun home devindrent,
 2000 Lur heritage de lui tindrent.
 Qant eils sunt tot en pais remes,
 Et Arthur esteit venuz as Nefs,
 En Engleterre estt revenuz.
 Et od grant joy resceuz.

2005 DUZE anz enpres cel repairement
 Regnast Arthur paisiblement.
 Mult se cuntint tant noblement,
 Tant bele et tant curteisement.
 Il fist faire la rounde table
 2010 Dunt Bretuns dient meinte fable.
 Mult l'aveit dieux honoré,
 De luy vint grant renomé:
 N'i oisès parler de chivaler
 Ke aukes foist a preiser
 2015 Qi de sa meismé ne fust,
 Si pur aveir entrer poust.
 Par la bounté de sun corage,
 Et par le loos de sun ~~ma~~ barnage,
 Dit Arthur qe mere passereit
 2020 Et tot France cunquerreit;
 Mais en Norwage primes irreit,
 Et la terre cunquerrereit.
 Grant Navye et grant gent mandast,
 En Norwage a force entrast.
 2025 Ricolf n'i volt mi fuir,
 Ne le pais ni volt guerpier.
 Vencuz fu Picolf et occis,
 Et plusieurs de ses amis.
 Tant Norwage issi fu deliveré,
 2030 A Looth sun soroge l'ad tot doné
 Mais qe il de Arthur la tendreit,
 Et a seigneur le conustreit.

ASCHILLE, qi ert Roy des Daneis,
 Vist lor Bretuns, vist les Norweis,
 2035 Vist Arthur, qi tote cunquerreit,
 Vist qe tenir ne se purreit:
 Ne se volt lesser damagier,
 Ne sa terre enpirer.
 Tant requist, et tant priast
 2040 Qe od le Roi Arthur sa acordast.
 Fealté fist, sun home devint,
 Sun regne tote de Arthür tint.
 Arthur fu liez del grant espleit
 Et del gaigne q'il feseit.
 2045 Ne li pout my uncore suffire:
 De Danemarche en fist eslire
 Bones chivalers et bons archiers,
 Ne sai quanz cent, ne kants milliers.
 Vener les volt od sei en France,
 2050 Et il si fist sanz demoraunce.
 Flaundes et Boloigne cunquist
 Vilos seisi et chastels prist.
 France out noun Galle a icel jour,
 Si n'i aveit Rei ne seignour.
 2055 Romeine en demeine l'aveit,
 Et en demeine la teneient.

39 a

39 b

- En garde ert a Frolle liveré,
Et il l'aveit longes gardé;
Treud et rentes receveit
2060 Et par termes les trametteit
A Rome, a le Empereour.
Frolle fu de grant vigour,
Des nobles hommes ert de Rome,
Ne dotast par sun corps nul home.
- 2065 FROLLE bout par plusieurs messages
Les saisines et les damages
Ke Arthur et sa gent feseit,
Ki as Romains lour dreit toleit.
Al bataille alast cuntre Arthure,
2070 Mais nel fist mi a bone eure:
Descunfit fu, si s'en fui
A Paris, si s'en garni.
Iloec Arthur atendrast,
Et illoec sei defendrast.
- 2075 Arthur selt qe Frolle feseit,
Ki a Paris sei garnissait:
Encres li vint si l'asegeast,
En bourges entour sei herbergeast.
L'ewe et la terre fist gardier
2080 Ke viande n'i pout entrer.
Grant poeple i aveit en la cité,
De viande i aveit grant chierté.
Lour vitailles ont mangé et usé,
Mult veises poeple afamé.
- 2085 Frolle veit le poeple distreit
Pur la vitaille qe faillieit,
Bien sei fiout en sa bounté:
Al Roi Arthur ad mandé
40 a 2090 Ke il deu en liz vegnent
Et corps a corps sei cumbatient;
Et q' d'els l'autreit occiorent,
Ou qe vif veindre purreit,
La terre tot al altre eust,
Et tot l'onur de France receut.
- 2095 Arthur assenti al mandement
Et mult le vint bien a talent.
Issi firent doner lour gages,
Et mistrent d'amparz outages.
- 2100 KANT il furent apparaillez,
De deus parz sei sunt aloignez.
En un bele pleine sunt amenez,
De cumbatre sunt aprestiez;
Dunc firent les renges voider,
C'ils s'en vont entreforir.
- 40 b 2105 Mais Frolle al ferir failli,
Ne sai se si chivala guenchi;
Et Arthur ad Frolle ferru
Desous le boucle del escu.

- 2110 De sun chival l'ad longe porté,
 De sur li point, si trait l'espee:
 Ja fust la bataille achevé (*)
 Qant Frolle sur ses piez sailli,
 Cuntre Arthur sa lance estendi,
 Sun chival dreit a piz ferri,
 2115 De si q'en qeor li enbati:
 Le chival et le chivaler
 Fist tot ensemble tresboucher.
 Dunc veisses genz estormir,
 Bretuns crier, armes seisir:
 2120 Venuz furent al capleiz,
 Kant Arthur est en piez sailliz,
 Levast l'escu, le chief covri;
 Frolle od s'espé requeri,
 S'espé hauceast cuntre munt,
 2125 Arthur ferri en mi le frunt;
 Li hearme quassast et derumple,
 Et li fort coifs fendi.
 En mi le frunt Arthur naverast,
 Et li sanc en vis li avalast.

 2130 KANT Arthur se senti naveré
 Et il se vist ensanglanté,
 A poi de ire se aragea,
 Sun fort escu enbracea;
 Caliburne out, s'espé, el poigne,
 2135 Qe il out eue en meinte besoigne.
 Ci l'out brandi par grant vertu,
 De ire et de mal talent fu esmeu;
 Frolle ad en sun le chief ferru,
 Jusques en espauls l'ad fendu
 2140 Trait et point, et cil chaist.
 Corveille et sanc tote espaundist,
 Des piez un poi eschaverast,
 Iloec morut, mot n'i sonast.
 Li citeizins pur Frolle plurent,
 2145 Et nekement as portes keurent,
 Arthur ont reseeuz dedenz,
 Et ses meianés et ses gentz.

 ARTHUR a Paris sojournast,
 Bailife assist, pees ordeinast.
 2150 S'ost devisast en deus parties,
 Si estaoli deus compaignies.
 A Hoel sun Neveu liverast
 L'un meité, si li rovast
 Od ceus cunquesist Angevyn
 2155 Gascoyn, Auverne et l'elton,
 Et li Burgoine conquerreit
 Et Lorenge, se il poeit.
 Hoel fist sun comandement
 Solonc sun establissement:
 2160 Barri cunquist, puis Torroigne,

(*) Just in ms.

Angevyn, Auverne et Gascoyne.

KANT Arthur out en pees la terre.
Ke de nul part n'en out guerre,
A unes Pasche a Paris

2165 Tint Arthur feste od ses amis.
A ses hommes rendi lour pertes,
Et a chescuns donast lour desertes.
Les terres q'il out cunquis
Donast a ses barons gentis:

2170 Chescun fu bien enherité,
Chescon solonc sun dignité.
Kant il out ses amis feofez,
Et fait riches tuz ses privez,
En Averille, qant esté entrast,
2175 En Engleterre trespasast.

Pur ses richeces demustrer,
Et pur faire de sei parler,
Prist cunseille qe li fu loié
Qe a Pentecoste, en esté,
2180 Fereit sun barnage assembler
Et dunc se froit coroner.

A Carlion en Glamorgan
Mandast tuz ses barons par baan,
Mandast ses Reis et ses Contes,
2185 Mandast ses Ducs et viscuntes,
Mandast Caisers et Abbez,
Mandast Priours et Evesquiez;
Et cil vindrent qe mandé furent,
Si cum a feste venir durent.
2190 Meint Roi et Ducs i vegnent
A Carloun sanz attargement:
Meint bel compaignie i veisses venir,
Et espesement chivalchier.

42 a

2195 Al matin, le jour de la feste,
- Ceo dit l'estoire de la jeste, -
Vindrent treis arceveves.
Et li abbé. et li Evesques,
El palais le Roi coronerent,
Et puis al mustier le menerent.

2200 Qatre espees i out a or,
Ke pointe, qe helte, qe entretor;
Qatre Reis ces quatre portolent,
Ke dreit devant le Roi aloient:
Cils mestiers lour apartenoit

2205 Qant li Reis feste ou curt teneit,
Cil d'Escoce et cil de Norwales,
Et li tierce esteit de Suthwales;
Cador de Cornewaille esteit
Ke la quarte espee teneit.

42 b 2210 Devant le Roi les Reis aloient,
Les espees en lour meinz portolent.

- Juso'al mustier s'en aloient,
 Grant joi tuz en demenerent.
 Devant la Reine Gonovre alerent
 2215 Quatre dames q'i portoient
 Quatre columbes blauncs plumez:
 Mult furent beles et afaitez.
- As processions out grant pres,
 D'aler avant chescun s'engros.
 2220 Kant la Messe fu comencié,
 Mult i avoit solempnité,
 Mult oïsses orgoïns soner
 Et clers chaunter et orgoïner.
 Kant le servise fu finé
 2225 Et 'Ite missa' ert chaunté,
 Li Reis ad sa corone ousté
 K'il avoit al mustier porté.
 Qant Arthur turnast del mustier,
 En sun palais s'en voïa mangier.
 2230 Assis furent li barun entour,
 Chescun de ordre de sun honor.
 Li seneschaus Keys out a noun,
 Vestuz d'un hermin pelicoun:
 Servy al mangier le Rei,
 2235 Mil chivalers avec sei.
 Beduer del altre partie
 Servist de la botelerie.
- ARTHUR fu assis el halt deïs,
 Entour li Contes et Reis.
 2240 Eis vos duze hommes blancs chanuz,
 Bien afublez et bien vestuz;
 Deus et deus en la sale vindrent,
 Et deus et deus as meins se tindrent.
 Duze esteient, et duze rames
 2245 De Olive tindrent en lour meins.
 Parmi le sale trespasserent,
 Al Roi vindrent, si le saluerent.
 De Rome, ceo distrent, vegneient,
 Et messenger de Rome esteient.
 2250 Un chartre ont devolupé,
 A Arthur l'ad un d'els livré
 De par l'empercour de Rome.
 Oïez de la chartre la summe:
- "LUCE, q'i Rome ad en baillie,
 2255 et de Romeins ad la seignorie,
 Maunde ceo q'il ad deservye
 Al Rei Arthur sun enemye.
 Mult me dedeigne en merveillant, (*)
 Et me merveille en dedeignant,
 2260 Ke par forfait et par orgoille
 Osez vers Rome ovrir tun oïle:
 Ne prendre cuntre Rome estrif

- 43 b
- 2265 Tant cum tu ses un Romeine vifs.
Tu ies issu de ta nature
Et trespasné as ta mesure.
Siez-tu qe tu es, et dunt tu vegnes,
Ki nos truz preignes et retiegnes?
Julius, nostre anceissour,
- Mais poi en preises sun honor -
2270 Prist Bretaigne, si'n out treud,
Et nostre gent l'ad puis eud.
Ore avez tolleit par presumptie,
Mult as fait grant folie.
2275 Uncore as fait greindre huntage,
Dunt plus nous est qe de damage:
Frolle, nostre baron, as mort,
Et France et Flandre tiens a tort.
Par ceo qe tu n'en as doté
Rome ne sa grant dignité,
2280 Te somonde li sené et maunde,
Et en somonant te comande.
Ke tu siez en my august
A Rome a ly, qe q'il te coust:
Apparaillez de faire droit
2285 De ceo qe tu li as tolleit;
Et si tu vas rien purloignant,
Ke si nel' facez cum jeo te mande,
Mongieu a force passeraï,
Bretaigne et France te touldrai:
2290 Ne savoras en nule lieu tapir
Dunt jeo ne te face saillir;
Lied a Rome te merrai
Et al sené te liverai."
- 2295 A ceste parole out grant bruit,
Et mult sei coroucient tout.
Mult oisses Bretuns crier,
Dieu aramir et dieu jurer
Ke cil serrunt des_honoré
Ke tiel message ont apporté.
44 a 2300 Mais li Reïs s'i levast es piez,
Ki lour criast: "Taisez, taisez!
N'i averunt mal: messagers sunt,
Seignurs ont, lour message font.
Dire pount quanq'il voudrunt,
2305 Ja pur nul home mal n'averunt."
- 2310 KANT la noise fu trespasné,
Et la curt fu reseuré,
Ses doïs, ses Ducs, ses privés
Ad tuz li Reïs od sei monez
En un soen tour peürin
Qe home apelle Tour Gigantin.
Cunseil iloc prendre voleit
Ke a ces messagiers respoundreit.

- 44 b
- 2315 "Baron, dist li Roi, q' estes cy,
 Mi compaignun et my amy,
 Cumpaignun de prosperité
 Et cumpaignun de adversité,
 Si grant guerre m'est avenu,
 Vous l'avez od mei sustenu;
 2320 Par vous su tant enhaucié
 Qe des qatorze regnes su Roy clamé.
 Totens vous ai trové feels
 En afaires et en cunseilles.
 Oye avez le maundment
 2325 Et des lettres l'entendement,
 Et le forfait et la fierté
 Ke li Romeins nous ont mandé:
 De Bretaigne treud demandent,
 Aver deivent, ceo nous mandent.
 2330 Cesar, dient, la cunquist:
 Fort home esteit, sa force fist.
 Ne sei purreint Bretuns difendre,
 Treud lour fist a force rendre.
 Vauntez sei sunt q'ils nos ancesours
 venquirent,
 2335 Treud et rentes lour tollirent.
 Tenir volent en heritage
 Le hunte a nous et le tollage.
 Treud de Bretuns aver soleient,
 Pur ceo de nous aver le voient.
 2340 Par mesmes cele reisoun,
 Et par altre tiel acheison,
 Pooms Rome chalengier
 Et bien la poom maintenir.
 Belin, qe fu Reis des Bretuns,
 2345 Et Brenne, duc des Burgeinouns,
 Dieu frere de Bretaigne nee,
 Chivalers vaillant et sené,
 A Rome alerent, ci l'asistrent.
 Assillierent la, si la pristrent.
 2350 C'ils le tindrent en fealté,
 Treud as Bretuns urent doné.
 Pur ceo me voil a Rome aler
 Pur treud aver, nun pur doner.
 De Fraunce et des autres countrés
 2355 Ki de lour meins avoms oustez.
 Ne deivent il nul plait tenir
 Qant ils ne les voleint garantir.
 Ore ait tote q' aver le poet:
 Altre dreiture n'i estoet.
 2360 Li Emperer nous manace:
 N'i voil dieux qe mal nous face.
 Petit nous preise, poi me creiment,
 Mais si dieu plest, et il s'avient,
 Ainz q'il se puis repairer
 2365 N'avera talent de manacier."
- 45 a

- KANT Arthur li Reis out parlé,
 Et as barons out tot cunté,
 Hoel parlast enpres le Rei:
 "Sire, dit-il, en ma fey,
 2370 Mult parlez resonablement,
 Nuls n'i poet mettre amendement.
 45 b Mande ta gent, somont tes hommes,
 Et nous qe ci a ta curt sumes.
 Trespassez mer sanz demorance,
 2375 Passe Burgoine et passe France,
 Passe Mungieu et pren Lumbarde
 Et l'Empereour, q' il te defie,
 Mettez en erreur et en effrei,
 Q' il n'ait leisir de grever toi.
 2380 Tiel plaie ont Romeins esmeud
 Dunt il serrunt tot cunfundud.
 Jeo irrai, Sire, en ta cumpaigne;
 Ainz qe ta bosoigne remaigne,
 2385 Dis mil chivalers armez,
 Et, si tu n'as avoir assez.
 Tote ma terre engagerai,
 L'or et l'argent te liverai:
 Ja mar ne larras un denier
 Tant qe vous ayez mestier."
 2390 ENPRES la parole Hoel
 Dit li Roi d'Escoce, Angusel.
 Cil esteit es piez drescié,
 En halt en ad "Arthur!" husché:
 "Sire, n'i fetez lunc demure,
 2395 Alez cumbatre od l'Empereour
 Ke treud de vous voit chalangier.
 Ore vous en pensez de li vengier,
 Et jeo meismes od toi irrai,
 Et deus mil chivalers merrai;
 2400 Et de gent a pié tiel plenté
 Ja pur home n'ert numbré."
 Kant li Reis d'Escoce out parlé,
 Tot ensemble ont dit et crié:
 "Honiz seit q' il remaindrat,
 2405 Et q' il sun power n'i ferast!"
 46 a Kant chescun out dit sun pensé
 Et Arthur out tot escouté.
 Ses brefs fist faire et seeler,
 As messagiers les fist leverer.
 2410 "A Rome, dit Arthur, poez dire
 Ke jeo su de Bretaigne Sire:
 Franc le tink et franc le tendrai,
 Et des Romeines la defendrai;
 Et ceo sachiez veraiement
 2415 Ke a Rome irrai prochainement,
 Ne mi pur Treud portier,
 Mais pur treud d'els demander."

- LI messagier d'Arthur turnerent,
A Rome vindrent, si cuntierent
2420 Cum faitement Arthur troverent,
Et ou et coment a li parlerent.
Kant li baron de Rome oierent
46 o Qe li messagier respundierent,
Et les chartres q'ils apportoient,
2425 A lour paroles sei acordierent:
A l'Empereour ont loié,
Et cele loos li vint a gré,
Ke tot sun Empire mandast
Mungieu et Burgoine passast,
2430 Al Rei Arthur sei cumbatist,
Ragne et corone lui tollist.
- LUCIUS Iber n'i targeast:
Reis, Ducs et Cundes mandast
Q'ils en veignent al disme jour
2435 Si cum chescun aime s'onour;
Seient a Rome a li tot prest
De quere Arthur la ou il ert.
Cils vindrent delivrent,
Et cils q'i oierent le maundement:
2440 Epistroc i vint, le Roi de Grece,
Et Echion, duc de Boece;
Hirtac i vint, le Roi d'Egipte,
Et de Crete Rois Ypolite,
De Babiloigne Miepessa,
2445 Et d'Espaigne Aliphatisma;
De Mede i vint li Roi Brocus,
Et de Libie Sertorius.
De ceus del ordre del ~~mes~~ soné
Ki en Rome urent dignité,
2450 Vint Marcel et Lucus Catei,
Cocca et Caius Metel;
Autre barons i out assez
Dunt jeo ne sai a vous nomez.
Kant il furent tot assemblé,
2455 Qatre cent mil furent numbré,
Et cent et quatre vint muntanz
Estre esquier et serjauntz.
Kant prest et appareilliez furent,
Entrant Auguste de Rome muerent.
- 2460 ARTHUR out sa curt departie,
As barons touz out quis aye.
Chescun die qantz chivalers merrast,
Chescun solonc le fee q'il ad.
Irreis, Colandeis, Islandeis,
2465 Daneis, Norweis et Orcheneis;
Sis vint mil armez ont pramis
A la guise de lour pais.
Cil de Normundi et d'Angieu,
Cils de Mans, cils de Peitou,
- 47 a

- 47 b
- 2470 Oils de Flandres, cil de Boloigne,
Od totes armes, sanz essoigne;
Qatre vint mil armez pramist⁹ent,
Et de tant deivent servir, oeo distrent.
Dis millier pramist Hoel,
- 2475 Deus milliers d'Escoce Angusel.
De Bretaigne, sa propre terre,
Ke homme cleime ore Engleterre,
Fist Arthur numbrer chivalers
Od hauberces seisante milliers.
- 2480 A MODRED, un de ces nevolz,
Chivaler merveilleuse et pruz,
Liverast en garde ~~xxx~~ ~~xx~~ ~~xx~~ Arthur sun regne
Et Guenowre la Reigne, sa femme:
Tot comanda fors la corone.
- 2485 Puis volt passer a Suththamtoun.
La furent ses nefes amenez
Et les meisnez assemblez.
Arthur meismes eschipa,
Barons et Contes i amena.
- 2490 Kant es Nefs furent tot entré
Et tide urent, et bon orré,
Dunc veissēs ancras lever,
Estrens traire, hobeans former;
Les voiles unt sus saché,
- 2495 Li mestre sunt as estorne hasté:
Belement comencierent a sigler,
Vent out bone et a pleiser.
Le gentz Arthur a joi aloient,
Bon vent avoient, bien sigloient.
- 2500 A mi nuit par mer curroient,
Vers Barbeflot lour cours tenoient,
Kant Arthur prist a somuler,
Endormy sei, ne pout veillier.
Vis li fu, la ou il dormeit,
- 48 a 2505 Ke halt en eir un urs veieit
Devers orient avolant,
Mult esteit gros et fort et grant,
Mult esteit d'orible façoun.
D'autre part veit un dragoun
- 2510 Ki devers occident voleit,
Et de ses oilz flambe jetteit.
Li Dragun le urs envaiseit,
Et cil foremost sei diffendeit.
Mais li dragun le urs enbraceout,
- 2515 Et a terre le noraventout.
Kant Arthur out un poi dormye,
Par le sounge q'il vist s'esveillie,
Esveillast sei, si s'en dreceast.
As ciers et as Rois lo mustrast,
- 48 b 2520 Tot en ordre la visioun
Q'il vist del urs et del dragun.
Asquns d'eis li ont respunduz
Ke li Dragun q'il out veuz

2525 Esteit de lui signaifiance,
 Et li grant urs est demustrance
 D'ascun Geant q'il occiereit,
 Ki d'estrangle terre vendreit.
 A cels paroles ajournast,
 Bele temps fäst, li soleile levast.
 2530 Al coste vindrent assez matin,
 A Barbeflot en port lantîn.
 Cum ainz purreint des Nefs lissierent,
 Par la cūntré s'espaunderent.
 N'aveit mi longes attendu
 2535 Ke Arthur oist et dit li fu,
 Ke uns Geant bien corumpuz
 Esteit de Espaigne venuz;
 Nece Hoel Eleine out pris,
 Ravye l'out, en le munte l'out mis
 2540 Ke home or Saint Michel apele:
 N'i aveit autier ne chapele.

2545 KANT Arthur en oist parler,
 Kei apellast, et Beduer,
 Ni volt parler a nul altre home.
 Cele nuit enpres ne preigne ensoigne,
 S'en alerent le Munt cerchant;
 Cuntre Munt sunt alé tot trei,
 Arthur, Beduer et Kei.
 2550 "Jeo irrai, dit Arthur, avant:
 Jeo m'en cumbaterai al Geant.
 Vous vendrez enpres moi arer,
 Et bien gardez qe nul i fier
 Tant qom jeo m'en purrai aider,
 Ne ja, si jeo n'en ai mestier."
 2555 Et Arthur s'est avant alé,
 Li Geant en ad trovez,
 Ke pres du fu sur le munte seoit,
 Un grant porc pres la fu turnoit.
 Arthur le quidast ainz susprendre
 2560 Ainz q'il pout sa maque prendre;
 Mais li Geant Arthur choisie,
 Merveillant sei es piez saillie;
 Sa mace ad el cole levce,
 Ki mult esteit gros et quarré.
 2565 Arthur le vit es piez estier,
 Et de ferir bien asceiner;
 S'espé brandist, l'escu levast,
 Le braz hauceast et estendi,
 Le Geant en le front ferri,
 2570 Les deus suroilz li atamast,
 Le sanc en les oilz li avalast.
 Kant li Geant se senti ferrue,
 Mult esteit de ire esmeue:
 Corut a Arthur, si l'enbraceast,

2575 Pur l'espé n'i lessast.
 Grant fu et fort, parmi le prist,
 A genuls Arthur venir fist;
 Mais cil tost s'envertuast,
 Es piez revint, si redrecaast,
 2580 Od caliburne tiel li donast
 Ke en le cervelle le baignast,
 Trait et peint, et cil chai,
 En trebouchant si fist un ori.
 Tiel escrois fist el chalement
 2585 Cum un cheine qe cheet pur vent.
 Arthur est al ost repairé,
 De la victoire fu joious et lié.

KANT de totz parz venud furent,
 Ceus q' od Arthur aler durent,
 2590 Arthur de jour en journé
 Ad Normundie trespasé;
 Fraunce passaast, vint en Burgoine,
 De tote partz vindrent a sun besoigne.
 Luce, q' ~~est~~ de Rome ert sire,
 2595 Encuntre Arthur volt chivalchier.
 Ses gentz ad bien ordeiné
 Et de cumbatre apresté.
 Arthur solt qe l'Empereour veneit,
 Et cum pur cumbatre se appareilloit.
 2600 C' ils sunt en un valeie entré,
 Ses gentz ad tost ordeiné:
 Duze eschieles ad ordeinez,
 Del primer fu Keus Justiserz,
 Et Beduer li botelers
 2605 Out en sa garde dis milliers;
 Al Conte de Frandres, Holdin
 Et a Guichard li Feltevyn
 Fu la terce eschiel comandez,
 Et il l'ont volunters guiez;
 2610 La quart out Jugen de Leicestre,
 Et la quinte Jonathas de Dorcestre;
 Li sixme de Cestre Cursalen,
 Et le setime de Baathe Uroen;
 Boos de Oxenford le novime,
 2615 Et li Quiens de Nicol le disime;
 Le cunte de Warwik out le unzime,
 Et li Roi d'Escoce le duzime. (*)

KANT Arthur out fait ses parties,
 Et ses eschieles departies,
 2620 Oiz q'il dit a ses nuriz,
 A ses barons, a leur fiz:
 "Barons, dit-il, mult mei cunfort
 Kant jeo vos grantz bountez record,
 Vos grantz pruez, vos grantz cunquest;
 2625 Tote temps vous trois hardiz et prest,
 Kant jeo recorde et jeo purpense
 Ke Bretaigne est en nostre tens:
 Par vous et par vos compaignons
 (*) de in ms.

50 a

50 b

- Rei su de qatorze regions:
 2630 Vos pruesce, vos bones meins,
 Ont deus foiz vendud les Romeins,
 Et vous uncore les venquerez,
 Si's averez duno vanoud treis foiz."
 Qant la parole fu finé
 2635 Ke li Rois out dit et mustré,
 A un voice li re(spundi)erent,
 Tot ensemble (s'escrierent
 Ke meulz voleint (iloe) murir
 Ke del champes sans victorie lassir.
 2640
 L'EMPEREOUR matin ~~l'empereur~~ levast,
 De cumbatre s'aparailast.
 Del un part de la vales
 Sunt la gent Romeine aresté;
 Del altre part en mi lour vis
 2645 Urent Bretun le champes purpris.
 Dunc vindrent as lances beiser, At
 Et as ~~gax~~ escuz fendre et percler;
 Enpres vindrent al capleiz
 Et as granz coups d'espees fourbiz.
 51 a 2650 Dunc i out estour merveilleuse,
 Uno ne vie plus perilouse.
 Bien firent Beduer et Sir Kei:
 Dieux! qels barons en curt le Rei!
 Kels seneschals, qels botelers,
 2655 Qant servent bien des brans d'asciers!
 Mais Beduer s'est folement alé,
 Li Reis Boccus l'ad encuntré:
 Beduer ferist par my le cors
 Et fist passer le fer de fors.
 2660 Beduer chiet, le qeor li part,
 L'alme s'en voit, Jhesu la gard!
 Kei ad trové Beduer mort.
 En talent ad q' l'enport:
 51 b 2665 Mult l'aveit chier et mult l'amout.
 Od tant de gent qe il out
 Fist les renges departir,
 Et la place lour fist guerpier.
 Mais al targier et al attendre
 Q'il fist al corps Beduer prendre
 2670 S'est li Reis de Libie aprismé,
 Sertorius out noun, mult ert preisé.
 Cil out Kei n'afé mertelement,
 Et occis out mult de sa gent:
 Mult l'ont n'afé, mult l'unt ferru,
 2675 Mais il l'ad bien le corps tenu.
 Porté ont Beduer al dragon,
 Volisent cil de Rome ou noun.
 ARTHUR vist sa gent sortir
 Et ceus de Rome rebaudir,

- 2680 Et le champe cuntre luy purprendre:
Ne pout ne ne volt plus attendre.
Od sa cumpaignie vint criant:
"Ke fetez-vous? Alez avant!
Veez moi icy vostre garaufft!"
- 2685 N'i lessez un soul aler vivant!"
Dunc veisses Arthur cumbatre,
Hommes occire, hommes abatre;
N'i purreint puis Romeins estier,
Ne ne purreient recourer.
- 2690 As grantz turbs s'en vont fuiant,
Les uns ~~sur~~ les autres abatant.
L'empereour fu abatuz,
El corps d'un lance fu ferruz.
Jeo ne sai qi le abatie,
- 2695 Ne ne sai dire qi le ferri:
En la presse fu entrepris,
Et en la presse i fu ocis.
Entre les mortz fu mort trovez,
Et el corps d'un lance navarez.
- 2700 Cils de Rome, cils d'orient,
Et li altre communement,
A plus tost q'ils poient fuient,
Bretuns les en chacent et occient.
Sanc veisses courer as russeaus,
- 2705 Et occis gisir as munceals.
Arthur se fist joieuse et lied,
Ke le orgoille de Rome out plaissied;
Ses gentz fiz enterrer,
En Abbeies les fist sepeler.
- 2710 Le corps fist del Empereour
Prendre et garder a grant honur.
A Rome en bere l'en envoiast,
Et a ceus de Rome maundast
Ke de Bretaigne, qe il teneit,
- 2715 Altre treud ne lour deveit.
Arthur remist en Burgoine,
Tote l'iverre i sojourne.
En esté volt Munoye passer
Et a Rome volt dreit aler,
- 2720 Mais Modred l'en ad returné:
Dieux! qele hunte et qel vileté
Ly fist qant sa femme prist
Et sa terre a ses oilz seisist!
Arthur oie, et de veire sout
- 2725 Ke Modred fei ne li portout.
Qssi vint Arthur a Whitsaund,
Del parjure Modred pleignant.
- 2730 ARTHUR fist ses gentz eschipper,
Tant menast gent, ne sai numbrer.
Modred lour fust a l'encontrer

52 a

52 b

- Od vint mil chivaler.
 Al entrer surterre fu occis
 Gawain, li pruz, li gentis.
 Li Roi Angusel i fu mortz,
 2735 Et plusurs de lour aforce.
 Mais puis qe Bretuns furent el terraine
 Et parigale furant el pleine,
 N'i pout Modred aver duré,
 Del champpe s'en est od sa gent alé.
 2740 Vers Cornewaille s'en est hasté,
 Graunt ost en ad ansemblé.
 Arthur n'out cure de sojourno,
 Kar vers Modred out graunt haïour;
 De Angusel ad grant doel oud
 2745 Et de Gawein q'il out pærdud.
 Modred n'en out de fuir cure,
 Sun corps volt mettre en aventure.
 Joust Tamre fu la bataille,
 En le entré de Cornewaille.
 2750 Iloec s'en volt le Roi attendre
 Et sun corps encuntre li defendre..
 Arthur i vint od ses chivalers,
 Plus i out qe cent milliers.
 Aitant sei sunt entreferu,
 2755 D'amparz i ferient par graunt vertu.
 Grant fu d'amparz la perde,
 Le pleine fu des mortz couvert
 Occis fu Modred en l'estour
 Et de sa gent tot li plusur.
 2760 Arthur, si la jeste ne ment,
 Fu illoec nafré mortelement;
 En Avaloun se fist portier
 Pur ses pæmes mediociner.
 Portier se fist en Avaloun.
 2765 Pur veir, puis l'en Incarnacion
 Cink cent et qarant et deuz anz.
 Damage fu q'il n'out enfauntz:
 Al fiz Cador, Costantin
 De Cornewaille, un soen cousin,
 2770 Liverast sun regne, et si li dist
 K'il fust Reis tant q'il revenist.
 Treis anz cil regna poestis,
 Ceo fu grant doel qant fu fenis..
 A Stonhenges fu aportiez,
 2775 Od grant honor enterrez.
- CONANT sis nece apres regnast:
 Orgoillouse fu, mult sei pæisant.
 Pees ne solt faire ne gardier.
 Ses gentz laissout entremeller.
 2780 Entre li meismes et sa gent
 Aveit grant descordement.

- quatre anz fu Reis et petit plus,
 Enpres fu Reis Vortiporus.
 En sun temps Saxsons releverent,
 2785 La terre tot aver quidoient.
 Mais li Roi sa terre diffendi,
 Et en bataille les venqui.
 Maladie l'en prist, si morust;
 A lundres ensepelie fust.
- 2790 CARIZ fu puis Reis de la terre,
 Mais tote la perdi par guerre.
 En sun temps vint la grant suverse
 Des paiens et de gent adverse
 Ke Curguint menast par Mer:
 2795 Ore le vous voil mustrer.
 54 a En Engleterre vint siglant,
 Saxons et paiens menant.
 En sa flot treis cent nefs aveit,
 En Bretaigne cil ariveit.
- 2800 Gorguint destruit meinte Cité
 Et meint chastel d'antiquité,
 Maint eglise et mainte clergie,
 Mainte ewesquied et meint abboyo.
 Kant il out gasté le pain,
 2805 Les viles arz, l'aver pris,
 Le regne ad a Saxsons doné.
 Li Reis Cariz s'en returnast,
 Colement par nuit s'en alast;
 En Gales dreit sa veie tint.
- 2810 Ne sai puis ou il devint.
 Saxsons ont la terre recueillie,
 Ke mult l'aveient encovie.
 54 b Pur un linage dunt il furent,
 Ki la terre primes receurent,
 2815 Si Se firent Engleis apeller
 Pur lour orine remembrer,
 Et Engeland ont apellé
 La terre qe lour ert doné.
- 2820 Desqe Brutus de Troie vint,
 Totens Bretaigne sun noun tint
 Jusc'al terme qe jeo vous die
 Qe par Curguint sun noun perdie.
 Les nons des viles trestournorent,
 En lour langage les nomorent.
- 2825 ENGLEIS voldroient Reis establir,
 Mais ne sei purreint assentir
 Ke un Rei soulement eussent,
 Et a un Rei tot sojette fuissent.
 Ne se acordent mi a une,
 2830 Ainz par cunseille commune
 Plusurs Reis par plusurs cuntrés,
 Si ont les terres devisés.
 Plusurs feiz s'entregueroient,
 Et plusurs feiz s'entre apuier nt.

- 2835 Issi ont longement esté
 Sanz les et sanz cristienté.
 Cent anz et plus i ont esté
 Sanz ley et sanz cristieneté.
 Parler en oye Saint Gregoire,
 2840 Ki a icel temps ert apostoire.
 Saint Austin i enveiait
 Ke las eglises sacrast.
 En Tamise vint primereement
 Et d'illoec passast en Kent.
 2845 A Cauntorbrie s'apristant
 Et li pöples mult l'onurast.
 55 a Reis Audebert, qe Kent teneit.
 De linage Hengist cil esteit,
 Cil ad Saint Austin baptisez,
 2850 Et en le saint founce regenererez.
 Enpres le Rei fu la meisné
 Regenererez et baptizé;
 Par le terre alout sarmonant,
 Musters fesant, clers ordeinant.
- 2855 KANT li Reis et li Saxson,
 Primes li Engleis et li baron,
 Urent tuz receuz baptesme,
 Enfantz levez et oint de creme,
 Arere s'en est repairé,
 2860 Mult esteit joieuse et lied.
 L'apostaille ad tot cunté
 Cum out le poeple regeneré.
 Cathwalens, un gentil bier
 55 b Cil out un partie de la terre.
 2865 Totes les Reis engueroiait
 Et descunfit et mort les ad.
 C'il out la terre et la seisin
 Et le tint jusc'al sa fin.
 Unze anz cil regnast;
 2870 Edwyn, sun fiz, en heritast.
 Cil tint le regne en bone peese
 Tot dis jusc'al sun decesse.
- OSWALD, sun fiz, un gentil bier,
 Pur cristienté lei garder,
 2875 Uns noble home de frank corage,
 Out la terre en heritage.
 Oswald fu martirizé
 Par Peanda, un diffaisé.
 Un des freres Oswald, Oswy,
 2880 Le regne sun frere seisy.
 Oswy out parenz et neveuz
 Assez riches et assez pruz,
 Ke pur aver part de la terre
 Pristent encuntre li estrif et guere.

- 2885 Mais Oswy bien sei diffendi,
 Qe nule terre ne luy tolli.
 Neuf anz cil Oswy regna;
 Malades esteit, si devia.
 A Ewerwio fu exporte,
 2890 A grant honor enovelee.
- CADWALADER enpres regna,
 Les barones l'on corona.
 En sun temps fu falt de blee,
 Et de la falt vient chierté.
 2895 Bien passez treis jours chivalier.
 N'i troverez qe achater.
 Ovek icel mesaventure
 Revint un altre, altresi dure:
 Mortalite fu grant de gent
 2900 Par air corumpu et par vent.
 Mangeant, parlant, alant morpent.
 Sudeinement, sanz langour devient.
 Cils q' les mortz enterorer durent
 En la sepulture mort chalerent.
 2905 Cathwalader, q' Rein estoit,
 Ki la terre garder devoit
 Par la grant mortalite
 En Bretaigne Minour est nle,
 Al Rei Anlaf, q' cult l'onura.
 2910 Tot dorechief li cunta
 De la grant mortalite,
 Et coment lur est failli le blee.
 Cathwalader n'i sojourna.
 Dedenz un mois devia.
- 2915 EGBRID sun fiz enpres regna.
 Les barons de la terre mult l'ama.
 Cil out la regne, si se fist coroner;
 Bien le saveit justiser.
 En sun temps Charlemain regna,
 2920 Ki l'onur de France garda.
 Egbrid trente et deus anz venqui:
 A Wincestre gist, et la finy.
- APRES li regna nun fiz,
 2925 Apelwolf out nun, mult fu gentiz.
 Cil dona a Dieu et a saint Pier
 Ke vous oiez Rome peny nomer.
 Apelwolf fu a Rome sot anz
 En la cite demorance.
 En repairant, par franchise priet
 2930 A femme demoisnel Judit,
 La feile Charlemain de France.
 Mais ne venqui puis qe cinc anz
 Qant il engrota et morust:
 A Wincestre nepelle fust.

- 2935 APRES li regna Aðilstan li pruz.
Mult par esteit amé de touz.
Escoco li firent grant encumbrora,
Soventefoiz le vont guerrier.
Main od le aide de la eslit
- 2940 Seint Johan, arcevesque de Everwio,
Furent li Escoteis descunfiz,
Meinte millier i furent oolz.
Seint Johan l'arcevesque mult bun feofa.
Rentes et honurs le dona;
- 2945 Puis volt a Lundres aler,
Tot l'iver i volt sojourner.
Grant dool fust c'il enmaladie;
Neuf anz regna et demye.
Qant il esteit devié
- 57 a 2950 A Wincestre fu enterré.
Puis regna Edgar sun frero,
Mult esteit bele bachelier.
Icol oure q'il nasquis,
Seint Dunstan en oie
- 2955 Les Angoles q'i chantierent
Emont en le firmament
Ke lon pees en sorra
Tant cum Edgar regnera;
Et si avint certainement;
- 2960 Tiel plenté i aveit entre tot gent,
Et pees et cuncorde i aveit,
Ke nule pleindre ne se poeit.
Seize anz le Roi regna:
En chescun an renovela
- 2965 Eglises, rentes ou abbeies,
Ou hospitals ou pontz ou voies.
Icol bon Reis enmaladie,
Mult fu dolent si amye.
A Lundres ert ensepellé
- 57 b 2970 Et od grant honor enterré.
- APRES li regna Edward,
Cil fu joefnes et de bon part,
Cil regna treis anz et demi;
A grant doel s'en finy
- 2975 Car Estrice, sa marastre, le flet ocire
A doel et a grant martire,
Pur coveitise de la regne doner
A Alvered, sun fiz, pur heriter.
A Schaftisbiry fu enporté,
- 2980 Od grant honor enterré.
- PUIS regna Alvered, sun frere;
Mais bastard ert de par sa mere.
Trente set anz oil regna;
En grant hunte sa terre garda,
Car Deneis sovent l'y gueroient
Et de sa gent mult damagierent.
- 2985

- Par le conseil Edriz vindront,
 Grant anuye sovent le firent.
 Cunte estoit cil de Salesbire,
 2990 Et de Wincestre cil fu sire.
 Le Roy pur douleur enmaladie,
 A Lundres gist, iloeo finie.
 A Saint Pole fu enterré,
 De ses amis mult regreté.
- 2995 EDMUNDE Irnoside, eis fiz.
 Apres li regna, Roy poestiz.
 N'i out longement la Realme tenu
 Ke grant guere n'en out eu;
 Car de Danemarche le Roi Knout
 3000 Od grant Navye vint a bot.
 En Engleterre ariva,
 58 a Plus de seisante mil armez amona.
 Contre le Roi bataille prist,
 Et en bataille le venquist;
 3005 Et le secunde jour suiant
 Edmunde le venqui en un champo.
 Mult i aveit d'amparz tueiz,
 Et d'amparz mult damagiez.
 Edriz li traître s'en ala,
 3010 Pur acorde mettre se pena
 Si qe la Realme fu departé.
 Et entre les deus Rois devinó.
 Puis par le tresun Edriz
 Fu li Rois Edmunde murdriz.
 3015 A Glastingbary fu enporté,
 A grant honor ensepolé.
- 58 b KNOUT seisy puis tot la terre,
 Totes les baruns i fist maunder:
 A Lundres grant feste tint,
 3020 Ducs et Contes, testuz i vint.
 Chescun li out fait homage,
 Povres et riches de hault parage.
 Knout enpres viii anz vesqui,
 A Lundres fu ensepoli.
- 3025 HARALD bastard puis regna,
 Totes ses barons mult l'ama.
 Quatre anz et demi en pees vesquy,
 A Wincestre enagroty.
 Iloe morut et devinast,
 3030 Iloe ensepolie l'en ad.
- PUIS regna Alred Axifot, sun frere,
 Le fiz Knout, c'il out mult chier.
 Le regne tint, bien le guida.
 Knout li Roi l'engendra
 3035 De un Francis k'avoit a nun Emma:

Mult par esteit boal cum gemme.
 Deus anz regna et dia jours.
 Puis fu ensepolie a grant honore.
 A Lambeth, pres de Lundres. morust,
 3040 Et a Wincentre ensepolie fust.

APRES regna Saint Edward,
 Fiz Alred, Roi de Bone part.
 Dieu et Saint eglise mult ama.
 Rentes et terres sovent dona
 3045 As povres abbeles et a hospitain:
 Mult par esteit tenuz beala.
 Mult grantz miracles fist dieu pur lie,
 Apres sa mort et en sa vie.

L'an del Incarnacion Jhesu crist
 3050 Mi seignante et sin,
 Et vint un de sun regne
 Devisa le Roi sun realme
 A William, bastard apellé,
 Sun Neveue et Duc de Normundie.

3055 Li Roi Edward enmaladie,
 Mult sei pleignent si amy.
 A Westmouster esteit enterrier,
 A grant honur ensepelez.
 Puis fu de sa tumba pris,
 3060 Et en fertre i fu mis;
 Devant le autier l'en ad posé.
 Dieu l'ad mult honoré:
 Les avogles fait lour veue aver,
 Et les sourdes en fait parlor.

3065 APRES Edward, Harald regnant,
 La terre a sun oes pris ad.
 Fiz Godwin cist esteit,
 Qi la cunté de Kent teneit.
 A tort ad la terre seisé.
 3070 Mais puis l'avoit chier a cumparé.*
 Neuf mois la terre tint
 Quant William Bastard li survint
 Od Normanz et od gentz armes,
 Harald en out mult gueroier;
 3075 Et Harald grant ost assembla,
 Encuntre William Bastard ala.
 Mais a Harald vint dure novele,
 Kar ferru fu parmi le cervele
 Od un gaine qe a li fu trait,
 3080 Ke de sun chief ne fu enpeint.
 A Waltham fu Harald enporté
 Et od honur ensevelee.

WILLIAM Bastard puis regna,
 Ke grant chivalerke amena.
 3085 Un grant abbele ad comencé
 Et grantz rentes lour ad doné

(*) See "Corrections," p. 239.

Ke pur les mortz tot jours chanteront,
 Pur ceus qe en bataille ocis furent.
 Les barons li firent homage,
 3090 De lui tindrent leur heritage.
 Vin un anz cist William regna,
 En Normundie esteit quant devia.
 A Cham fu li Roi porté,
 Entre ses parentz ensevelé.

3095 PUIS regna William le Rous:
 Sun fir esteit, mult orgueilleux.
 Grant reddour fist en sa terre,
 Nul n'i osant mover guere.
 Duze anz cil le regne tint,
 3100 Au darain cil malades devint.
 A Wincentre gist et devia,
 Iloec en sepulture sepulcre l'en posa.

60 a

PRIMES Henry puis regna,
 Sun frere esteit, q' mult l'ama.
 3105 A Londres ceo fist coroner,
 A Westmouster devant le autier.
 Cil fist faire les bones leis
 Ke uncore tegnent les Engleis.
 Trente sis anz cil regna,
 3110 A Lundres esteit et devia.
 A Hedding esteit porté,
 En le abbeye ensevelé.

PUIS sun Neveu Esteven regna,
 Le Realme prist, bien le garda.
 3115 Saint abbé en sa terre fist.
 Mult richement les enfranchist.
 Dis neuf anz la terre garda,
 Maladie en prist, o'il devia.
 A Faverocham fu enporté,
 3120 Od grant solempnité enterré.

60 b

PUIS le secunde Henry regnat.
 Sun fiz esteit, et mult l'onura.
 Mult par esteit orgueilleuse et fier,
 Et totens de fausine maintenir.
 3125 Les franchise voudroit retraire
 Ke Saint Eglise deveroit aver.
 Saint Thomas le cuntrediseit,
 Ke le archevesché de Cantorbire tenoit.
 Iur ceo le fist a doel morir,
 3130 A Cantorbire le fist occire.
 Vin set anz cil regna,
 A Font Ewerard engrêta.
 Iloec ses barons l'ensepelist,
 Ki mult grant doel pur lui en fist.

3135 PUIS regna Richard sun fiz.

- Cist esteit Reis poestiz,
 Sun Realme mult bien garda
 Ke nully ne le guerxoia.
 Cil les payens novent gueroieit
 3140 Et noventefoiz les damageit.
 Mais illec fu nafré,
 Od un gaine a mort jetté.
 Cil regna dis anz et demy,
 Grant doel fu qant fu finy.
 3145 A Font Everard en fu porté,
 Dejouste sun pier ensevelé.
- PUIS regna Johan sun frere,
 Sun Realme guie en bele manere;
 Mais grant adversité aveit
 3150 Pur Mestre Esteven, q'il ne voleit,
 Qe l'Apostolle aveit envoié
 Receivre a un Evesché:
 Fu Engleterre entredit,
 Ne messe ne baptesme n'i avait.
 3155 Sis anz et treis quartiers et un mois
 Durast l'entredit a Estrois.
 Innocent la pape out a noun,
 Mult par esteit seinte hom.
 En temps le Roi out grant guere
 3160 Par entre les barons d'Engleterre.
 Dunc esteit Sire Lawis arivé,
 Le fiz Roi Phelippe de France nos.
 Cil fist pais en la terre,
 Ke nuls vers altres n'i moüst guere.
 3165 Johan regna seize anz et demy,
 Mult sei pleignent si amy.
 A Wincentre esteit porté.
 A grant honor ensepelee.
- PUIS regna sun fiz Henry,
 3170 Cist out le regne en baillie.
 En sun temps les barons de la terre
 Contre luy moverent grant guere.
 La bataille de Lewes fu en sun temps,
 Mult i perdi de ses parenz;
 3175 Et de Evesham la bataille,
 Ou mainte mil fu ocis sanz faille,
 Et Sir Symond de Muntford,
 Et maint altre de sun efforz;
 Et Sir Henry, sun fiz.
 3180 Et maint pruz chivaler gentiz;
 Et Sir Hugh le despenser,
 Et maint vaillant bachelor.
 Neuf anz cincokant et sis
 Cist esteit Reis poestis.
 3185 Mult par esteit enfeblee,
 Si cheeit en un maladie;
 Cist morust, et fu portez,
 A Westmouster ensepelee.

61 a

61 b

- 3190 APRES li regna sun fiz,
 Edward, q' estait poestiz.
 Cil meintefoiz en ala
 En Escoce, grant guere movea:
 Soventesfoiz les chaceout,
 Et soventesfoiz praies pernout.
 3195 Bien solt son Realme maintenir
 Et les rebelles bien justiser.
 Totens ses barons bien l'amercent.
 Car totens bien les maintenerent.
 N'i ama losengier ne larron,
 3200 Touz les fist voidé sa Region.
 Karant et treis anz cil regna
 Ke nulli ne le gueroia.
 62 a A Londres voit pur sojourner,
 Iloco fu tot le yver,
 3205 Iloco par maledie languist
 Et morut cum dieu vousist.
 Iloco estoit ensevelee
 A Westmouster pur solempnité.
- 3210 EDWARD, sun fiz, apres regnast,
 Cil tint la terre, si le gardast.
 Cil fu de grant poestis,
 C'il maintint bien ses franchis
 De Saint Eglise, et mult l'amoit,
 Rentes et possessions lour donoit;
 3215 As povres freres de religion
 Sovent dona mult riche doun.
 Bien solt sun Realme maintenir;
 62 b As Escoce fist maint encumbrer,
 Car soventesfoiz les guerlout,
 3220 Et soventesfoiz les destruout.
 En sun temps surdit grant avie
 Par entre ses barons et lui,
 Pur un baron q' fu en la terre,
 Ke homme appelleit Hugh l'Espensier.
 3225 Le Roi le vousist maintenir,
 Car il estoit sun cunseiller.
 Pur ceo les barons urent avie,
 De la Realme l'ont exillie.
 Li Rei n'i trova en li si bien noun,
 3230 Si le fist aver possession
 De ses rentes et de ses fees,
 Si li out ses portes restorez:
 Od li le tint cum ainz fist.
 Kant les barons iceo vist,
 3235 Cuntre le Roi pristrent guern,
 Cuntre li chivalcherent en sa terre.
 Li Roi grandement se coroucea,
 Grant ost i assembla.
 Touz q' encuntre li chivalchierent,
 3240 Prendre les fist, si's enoroierent.
 Puis par un Conte de la terre
 Ke l'em appelleit Rogier Mortimer,

- Li surdit mult grant huntage.
 Cil li tolli sun heritage,
 3245 O'il fist Sir Hugh occire,
 Et a vile huntage decoler.
 Puis le Roi par force prist,
 Al chastel de Berols le tramist:
 A vile mort le fist morir,
 3250 Et vileinement le fist mourdrir.
 Vint anz fu Reis poestis,
 Et qant fu mort et fenis
 A Gloucestre esteit porté,
 A grant honore ensevelee.
 3255 Dieu l'ad grandement honoré,
 Car meint home ad deliveré
 De la langure qe li teneit:
 Dieuz pur li granz miracles ad fait.
- APRES li regne sun fiz qe or est,
 3260 Ke dieu li garde se li plest:
 Edward li noble cunquerour,
 Ki fort et pruz est en estour.
 Cil ad grant guere comencé,
 Pur ses dreitures s'en est pené
 3265 Encuntre le Roi de France en sa terre.
 Dieu, q' il tot poet justiser,
 Li doint grace et power
 Q' il poet la victorie aver.

Amen.

Explicit Brutus

NOTES ON THE TEXT

The text given reproduces that of the ~~ms~~ ms except for the following details:

Punctuation has of course been added. The only punctuation in the ms is an inverted semi-colon ; and an oblique stroke /. The former is of frequent occurrence within the line and is usually represented in the transcription by a colon or comma, though in some cases its purpose is doubtful and it is not in accord with any modern rules of punctuation. / occurs four times, and seems to be chiefly decorative.

The scribe's use of capitals is preserved except for changing Descoce into d'Escoce, Lemperere into l'Emperere, etc., and omitting them from non-substantives nuriz 148, monaile 1661.

Roman numerals have been replaced in all except two cases by the French words spelt in conformity with habits shown in a few examples written in full. The exceptions are vii (1698) and viii (3023); the scribe indicates two and three i's respectively, but the correct reading should be un and vin.

The usual abbreviations and compendia have of course been expanded.

Words and letters within parenthesis are suggested renderings for those effaced by wear or stains in the ms.

There are no marginal "scribbles", except that beside the illustration on f. 34 a, showing Oota and Cosa being led into the Tower; the hand responsible for the text, or a similar one, has written in red ink "Oota le fiz Hengist." Catchwords are found at the foot of ff. I b, and 32 b. The former consists of the whole verse appearing at the top of f. 92; as this is exceptional, it may suggest that the misplacement of the leaves (V. Introduction, p. 4) took place when the book was first made.

Corrections. Definite clerical errors are few. Incarcacion appears at v 191 for Incarnacion, en for et 591, for ne 639, et for ke (?) 893, le for ke 1834, lust for fust or eust 2111, ses for les (?) 3212, le for ne 798, et for en 2258, de for le 2617. "P comparé" at v. 3070 seems to show change of intention from purpayé to cumparé.

The syllable en seems to have given some trouble. It is apparently omitted in femines 504, covable 1186, and superfluous in derainenement 716, oreiment (3rd pers. sing. of oraindre) 2843. For omission of ne see p. 129. Er may be omitted in liverai (fut. livrer) 682, 2293, a in mortier aloer 1190, en in v. 1554, le in aver deivent 2329. V. 2662 should perhaps read qil l'enport.

Judging from Wace's text, cest moigne is necessary after Rei to complete v. 822, paien after si in v. 1072.

It is possible that the syllable ei is omitted in many verbs apparently in the imperfect indicative or the conditional, e.g. creient 180, gueroient 838, manacent 839, garirent 1094, guer-pisent 1095, elirent 1130, ~~parlerient~~ destruerent 1350, cunsail-lerent 1480, etc. These spellings may have another explanation, however. V. pp. 115, 168. Possible corrections in verbs are: parleroient for parloient 1147, cremoient for cremeit 1401, aveient for aveit 2055, aporterent for aportoient 2424, s'entre-gueroierent for s'entregueroient 2834, damagieient for damagie-
rent/2986..

GLOSSARY

Chief words or meanings not found in the dictionaries.

- ACOMUNER v. t. 478, share
 ACONDUER v. t. 905, bring
 AFIER v. ref. 306, be confident
 AFORCE 1977, AFFORCE 212, EFORCE 476, 1631, n. force,
 army, cf. effortz
 AITANT 451, 818, 824, 1859, adv. then
 AIN 995, adj. (Eng.) own.
 APRISMER v. n. (de), 279, prepare? consent? V. p. 133.
 ATTENDRE v. n. (a), 304, attend to
 AUTREIT pron. 2091, the other
 AVIE n. 3221, 3227, contest, strife. V. p. 132.
 BRETANCE n. 987, 1607, Breton or British language
 CAROLE N. 1526, stone circle, (word first found in Waco)
 CUNOUD, past part. 73, pres. indic. 1276, of cunauivre
 DEDEIGNER v. ref. 9, 2258, be disdainful (used by Waco,
 but Godefroy's examples are late)
 DEPARTIEMENT n. 615, departure. Cf. descordielement 2781.
 DESERVIR v. n. 595, stay (s'arester?); v. a. 2256, decide
 (arester?) - Waco's word
 DESI QE pssp. 620, 2115 - desi (≠ desquo?)
 DESNEIER v. a. 1243, refuse
 ENAGROTIR v. n. 3029, fall sick
 ENFRANCHIR v. a. 3117, bestow privileges on
 (ESGARDER v. a. 514, for esgarer
 ERRER v. n. 1488, for arer
 ESTORNE n. 2495, (Eng.) ~~stern~~ helm, rudder
 FORCELETTE n. 450, fortress
 GAIGNER v. n. 1495, wend (gaigner ~~de~~ pried?)
 GAINNE 3080, GAIGNE 3143, n., arrow
 GUERRER v. a. 2938, 2986, wage war on
 LENTIN adj? adv? 2531, form of lentif
 LIED A LIED adv. 40, = lez ~~de~~ lez
 LEVE n. 1586, for levre or levres
 MENE adj. 286, second. V. p. 134.
 MURE(?) adj. 895. V. p. 39.
 NECE n. masc. 399, 2777, for nies
 NOBLEI n. 554, pomp
 PERILER v. n. 502, 505, be in peril
 POICE n. 1671 (for polce?), pulse
 PRUEZ n. 2624, prowess (plur.)
 RECETTE n. 970 (for recet). retreat
 REMELLER v. n. 1120, fight again
 REMUER v. n. 233, remove
 SEPELER v. a. 2709, bury (ensepeler in Chronicle)
 SUVERSE n. 2793, flood, invasion (sorverne in Waco)
 TRAIRE v. ref. 1367, gather (= s'attirer)
 VENCER v. a. 2397, v. p. 133.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

- ADILSTAN 2935; Aethelstan grandson of Alfred.
 ALDROGEN 649, 651, 676, 692; king of Britain.
 Alemeine 1616; Germany.
 ALIPHATISMA 2445; Spanish chief.
 ALRED AXIFOT 3031, 3042; Harold Harefoot. V. p. 70
 ALVERED 2978, 2981; Aethelred the Redeless. V. p. 69
 Ambesbirie 1598, Aumesbire 1505, Aumesbirie 1140; Amesbury
 Angevyn 2154, 2161, Angieu 2468; Anjou.
 ANGUSEL 2391, 2475, 2734, 2744; king of Scotland, Arthur's ally.
 ANLAF 2909; Danish king of Ireland. V. p. 67
 APPAS 1644, 1659; murderer of Aurelius.
 Aquila Aquile 546; Aquileia.
 ARELIUS 1355, AURELIE 1435, 1614, 1635, AURELIUS AMBROSIUS 714;
 son of Constantine and king of Britain.
 Armoriche 426, 1343; Armorica.
 ARTHUR 1843, 1875, 1933, 1935, 1943, 1953, 1962, 1965, 1971, 1977,
 1981, 1983, 1993, 1996, 2002, 2006, 2019, 2031, 2035, 2040,
 2042, 2043, 2067, 2073, 2075, 2088, 2095, 2107, 2113, 2121,
 2125, 2128, 2130, 2146, 2148, 2162, 2165, 2228, 2238, 2251,
 2257, 2366, 2393, 2407, 2410, 2418, 2420, 2430, 2436, 2460,
 2478, 2482, 2488, 2498, 2502, 2516, 2535, 2542, 2548, 2549,
 2555, 2559, 2561, 2565, 2574, 2577, 2586, 2589, 2590, 2595,
 2598, 2618, 2686, 2706, 2716, 2724, 2726, 2728, 2752, 2760.
 ARTHURE 2069; king of Britain.
 ARVIRAGUN 2, 85, 105, 120, ARVIRAGUS 23, 43, 68, 73, 75, 87, 109,
 139; son of Cymbeline, king of Britain.
 ACHILLE 2033; king of Denmark.
 ASTLAPIADOC 217, ASTLEPIADOC 209; king of Britain.
 ATHELWOLF 2924, 2927; Aethelwulf, king of Wessex and Kent, d. 858
 AUDESERD 2847; Aethelbert, king of Kent.
 Auguste 2459; month of August.
 AURELIE etc. v. ARELIUS.
 AUSTIN 2841, 2849; Saint Augustine.
 Auverge 2155, 2161; Auvergne.
 Avaloun 2762, 2764; Avalon.
 Averille 2174; month of April.
 Baathe 2613; Bath, Somerset.
 Babiloigne 2444; Babylon.
 Harbeflot 2501, 2531; Barfleur.
 Barri 2160; Berri.
 BEDUER 2236, 2543, 2548, 2604, 2652, 2656, 2658, 2660, 2662, 2676;
 Arthur's Seneschal.
 BELIN 2344; Gaulish chief, brother of Brennus.
 Berce 3248; Berkeley, Glos.
 BOCCUS, 2657, BROCUS 2446; king of Media.
 Boece 2441; Basotia?
 Boloigne 2051, 2470; Boulogne.
 BOOS 2614; earl of Oxford under Arthur.
 BRENNE 2345; Brennus, Gaulish chief.

- Bretaigne 200, 211, 237, 245, 254, 297, 356, 398, 1353, 1485, 1615, 1619, 1756, 2270, 2289, 2328, 2346, 2411, 2627, 2714, 2736, 2799, 2820; Britain.
- Bretaigne minor 441, 646, Bretaigne minour 2908; Brittany.
- Bretun 33, 319, 431, 563, 622, 826, 660, 664, 1019, 1082, 1119, 1131, 1563, 1595, 1607, 2645, Bretuns 31, 34, 35, 36, 54, 204, 269, 440, 442, 533, 537, 547, 556, 633, 647, 697, 931, 1020, 1076, 1090, 1123, 1147, 1150, 1365, 1397, 1401, 1415, 1430, 1524, 1549, 1559, 1560, 1589, 1742, 2010, 2034, 2119, 2296, 2332, 2338, 2344, 2351; Briton, Britons.
- BRUTUS 2819; legendary ancestor of the Britons.
- Burgeinouns 2345; Burgundians.
- Burgoine 2156, 2375, 2429, 2592, 2716; Burgundy.
- CADOR 2208, 2768; king of Cornwall under Arthur.
- CADWALADER 2891, CATHWALADER 2905, 2914; last British king.
- Caliburne 2134, 2580; Arthur's sword.
- Cantorbire 3128, Cantorbirie 857, 3130, Cauntorbirie 2845; Canterbury.
- CARADOC 376, 386; earl of Cornwall.
- CARIZ 2790, 2807; king of Britain.
- Carlion 2182, Carloun 2191, Karliun 1512; Caerleon-upon-Usk.
- CATHWALENS 2863; king of "a part of the land," evidently a confusion of Caedwalla the Saxon and Cadwallon of Wales.
- Cestre 2682; Chester.
- Cham 3093; Caen.
- CHARLEMAIN 2919, CHARLEMEIN 2931; Charlemagne.
- CHEREDIC 1018; Vortiger's interpreter. Actually the name of a Saxon leader.
- Cicestre 1934, Circestre 702; Cirencester.
- Cise 517; Scythia.
- CLAUDIUS 9, 24, 63, 78, 113, 118, 138; Roman emperor.
- COCCA 2451; Roman senator.
- COEL 213, 219, 224, 251, COIL 240; king of Britain.
- COIL 147, 151, 153; king of Britain.
- COLGRIN 1890, 1907, 1910, 1941, 1946, 1950, 1951; Oeta's ally.
- Coloigne 512; Cologne.
- COMPERD 339; king of Norway. 437.
- CONAN 371, 373, 375, 379, 381, 399, 435, 449, 468, 469, 525, 647, 649, 663; Octaves' nephew.
- CONANT 2776; king of Britain after Constantine of Cornwall.
- Conigburne 1421, 1445; Conisborough.
- Cornewaille 276, 1793, 1811, 2208, 2740, 2749, 2769; Cornwall.
- COSA 1764, 1777, 1879, 1889, 1898, 1906; COSANT 1772; Hengist's nephew, perhaps the same as Ebissa; called Eosa in other versions.
- COSTANS (i) 234, 247, 253, 263; Constantius Chlorus.
- COSTANS (ii) 732, 747, 750, 754, 760, 763, 846, 1354, COSTANT 741, OOSTANZ 711; eldest son of Constantine (ii).
- COSTANTIN (i) 266, 278, 298, 384, COSTENTIN 259, 267, 303; Constantine the Great.
- COSTANTIN (ii) 684, 718, COSTENTIN 680, 695, 704, 1341; King of Britain.
- COSTANTIN (iii) 2768; king after Arthur.

Crete 2443.
 CRIST 159, 688, 689; Christ.
 CURSALEN 2612; earl of Chester.
 Daneis 558, 574, 616, 766, 2033, 2465, 2985; Danes.
 Danemarche 2046, 2999; Denmark.
 Dertemeus 1363; Dartmouth.
 DODDANYN 1989; king of "Gothland."
 Dorcestre 2611; Dorchester
 BUNIAN 167; Roman missionary.
 DUNSTAN 2954; St. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury.
 DYANOTH 461, 479, 487; Deonatus, governor of Britain.
 DYNABUS 1221, 1223; Merlin's youthful adversary.
 EBISSA 1063, 1438; nephew or cousin of Hengist, perhaps Oeta.
 ECHION 2441; duke of Boeotia.
 EDGAR 2952, 2958; king of Wessex.
 EDMUNDE IRNESIDE 2995, 3006, 3014; Edmund Ironside.
 EDRIZ 2987, 3009, 3013; Edric Streona.
 EDWARD (i) 2971; Edward the Martyr.
 EDWARD (ii) 3041, 3055, 3065; Edward the Confessor.
 EDWARD (iii) 3190; Edward I; (iv) 3219; Edward II; (v) 3261;
 Edward III.
 EDWYN 2870; king of Northumbria.
 EGBRERD 2915, 2921; Egbert, king of Wessex, first overlord of
 England.
 Egipte 2442; Egypt.
 ELDADUS 1481; bishop under Aurelius
 ELDOLF 1425, 1451, 1454, ELDOLFS 1161; earl of Gloucester.
 ELEINE (i) 225; wife of Coel.
 ELEINE (ii) 253, 288, 293, 305, 384; Coel's daughter, wife of
 Costans (i).
 EMME 3035; wife of Canute.
 Engeland 2817.
 Engleis 2815, 2825, 2856, 3108; English.
 Engleter 7, 445, 521, 2003, Engleterre 128, 463, 480, 539, 552,
 1597, 2477, 3001, 3153, 3160, Engleterre 16, 157, 224,
 367, 2185; England.
 EPISTROC 2440; king of Greece.
 Escocce 325, 331, 400, 528, 559, 572, 577, 1064, 1390, 1495, 1766,
 1907, 2206, 2391, 3192; Scotland.
 Escocce 617, 783, 2937, 3218; Scots.
 Espagne 235, 2445, 2537; Spain.
 ESTEVEN (i) 3113; Stephen of Blois.
 ESTEVEN (ii) 3150; Stephen Langton.
 ESTRICE 2975; Ethelfrida.
 Everwic 2940, Ewerwic 1440, 1459, 1767, 1771, 2889; York.
 Evesham 3175.
 Faverescham 3119; Faversham.
 Flandre 2277, Flandres 2470, Flaundres 2051, Frandres 2606;
 Flanders.
 Font Everard 3145, Font Ewerard 3132; Fontevrault.
 France 415, 424, 452, 453, 1703, 2020, 2053, 2094, 2277, 2289,
 2375, 2920, 2931, 3162, 3265, Fraunce 2354, 2592.
 Francis 416, 467, 3035; French.
 FROLLE 2057, 2062, 2075, 2085, 2105, 2107, 2112, 2123, 2138,
 2144, 2276; Roman governor of Paris.
 GAFAN (for Fagan) 168; Roman missionary to Britain.

GAIUS METEL 2451; Roman senator
Gales 128, 736, 1179, 1210, 1370, 1517, 1615, 1633, 1691, 2809;
 Wales.
Galle 2053; Gaul.
Gascoyn 2155, Gascoyne 2161; Gascony
~~GAUWIK~~
 GAWWIN 2733, 2745; Arthur's nephew.
 GENUIS 117, 123, 135; daughter of Claudius
 GILLAMORUS 1547, 1561, 1975, 1980; King or kings of Ireland
 opposing successively Uther and Arthur.
Glamorgan 2182.
Glastingbiry 3015; Glastonbury.
Gloucestre 134, 189, 213, 1161, 1167, 3253; Gloucester.
GODWIN 3067; earl Godwin, father of Harold.
Gollande 1989; "Gothland."
Golandels 2464, Gollandels 557; men of Gothland.
Gonore 1371; Ganarew, Herefordshire.
 GONOVRE 2214, GONOWRE 1957, GUENOWRE 2483; Arthur's wife.
 GONWAIS 1988; king of Orkney.
 GORQUINT 2800, GURQUINT 2794, 2822; Gormond, a Saxon chief,
 no doubt the same as Guthrum.
 GORLOIS 1793, 1799, 1811, 1831, 1834, 1847, 1849; earl of
 Cornwall.
 GRACIAN 534, 551, 556; Roman general.
 GRACIEN 418, GRATIEN 456; brother of Valentinian.
Grece 2440; Greece.
GREGOIRE 2839; Pope Gregory the Great.
GUICHARD 2607; a vassal of Arthur.
 GUINCELIN 644, GUINOELINS 642, 686; archbishop of London.
 HAMON 37, 42, 67, 71, 75, HAMOUN 25; counsellor of Claudius
 HARALD BASTARD 3025; Harold Harefoot. V. p. 70.
 HARALD 3065, 3074, 3075, 3077, 3081; king Harold.
 HENGIST 853, 872, 882, 934, 936, 938, 968, 977, 997, 1041,
 1042, 1043, 1044, 1051, 1058, 1068, 1112, 1116, 1121,
 1125, 1135, 1143, 1176, 1389, 1393, 1405, 1407, 1419,
 1431, 1433, 1449, 1455, 1756, 2748;
 HENRY (1) 3103, 3121; (11) 3169; Henry I, Henry II.
 HENRY 3179; son of Simon de Montford.
 HIRTAO 2442; king of Egypt.
 HOEL 2152, 2158, 2368, 2390, 2474, 2538; Arthur's nephew.
 HOLDIN 2606; count of Flanders.
 HORS 853; Horsa.
 HUGH LE DESPENSER 3181; Chief Justiciar of the barons
 HUGH LE ESPENSER 3224, 3245; favorite of Edward II
 HUMBAUS 427; Armorican chief.
Humbre 531, 561, 928; Humber.
 IOERNE 1799, 1821, 1836, 1840, 1841, 1871; wife of Gorlois.
 INNOCENT 3157; Innocent III.
Irland 1969, Irlande 540, 559, 1527, 1546, 1625, 1638, 1704,
 1731, 1743, 1970, 1973, 1983, 1996.
Irreis 1541, 1548, 1557, 1692, 1731, 2464; Irish.
Islande 1984; Iceland.
Islandeis 2404; Icelanders.
Jherusalem (abbrev.) 289.
JHEBU (aborev.) 159, 2661, 3049.

JOHAN (St) 2940, 2943; John of Beverley., archbishop of York.
 JOHAN 3147, 3165; king of England
 JONATHAN 2611; earl of Dorchester.
 JUBITER 913; Jupiter.
 JUDIT 2930; daughter of Charles the Bald.
 Jues 290; Jews.
 JUGEN 2610; earl of Leicester.
 JULIUS CESAR 2268, 2330; Julius Caesar.
 Kaer Karai 987; Celtic name of Thongocaster.
 Karlun, v. Carlion.
 KATIGER 1057; son of Vortiger.
 KEI 2543, 2548, 2652, 2662, 2672, KEUS 2603, KEYS 2232;
 Arthur's buſſer.
 KENBELIN 1; Cymbeline.
 Kent 850, 1047, 1051, 1175, 2844, 2847, 3068.
 Kemedyn 1216; Carmarthen.
 KNOUT 2999, 3017, 3123, 3032, 3034; Canute.
 Lambeth 3039.
 LAWIS 3161; Louis, son of Philippe-Auguste, later Louis VIII.
 Leicestee 2610; Leicester.
 LEONIN 293, LEONYN 288, LYONYN 383; uncle of Eleine.
 Lewes 3173.
 Libie 2447, 2670; Libya.
 Lindeseye 937; part of Lincolnshire.
 Londres 256, 491, 1083, 3105, 3203, Lundres 347, 581, 640, 696
 758, 1778, 1784, 1791, 2789, 2945, 2992, 3019, 3024, 3039
 3024, 3110; London.
 LOOTH 1888, 1892, 1904, 2030; brother-in-law of Arthur.
 Lorenge 453, 2157; Lorraine.
 LUCE 2254, 2594, LUBIUS IBER 2432; Roman emperor.
 LUCES 154, LUCIUS 198, LUCY 183; first Christian king of Britain
 LUCES CATEL 2450; Roman leader.
 Lombardie 467, 2376; Lombardy.
 Lundreis 831; citizens of London.
 MAGANT 1256; soothsayer.
 Mans 2469; Le Mans?
 MARCEL 2450; Roman leader.
 MARIN 286; uncle of Eleine.
 MARIUS 143; son of Arviragus.
 MAXENCE 271; emperor Maxentius.
 MAXIMIAN 382, 393, 403, 411, 421, 524, 533, 550, 651, MAXIMIEN
 296, 402, 443, 545; Maximius, killed by Theodosius.
 May 1142.
 Mede 2446; Media.
 MELGA 514, 517, 520, 555, 571, 612; king of Scythia.
 Meneve 1634, 1692; Menevia, (St. David, Pembrokeshire)
 MERCURIUS 904, 913.
 MERLIN 1221, 1223, 1241, 1249, 1279, 1281, 1283, 1293, 1298, 1
 1299, 1308, 1309, 1328, 1331, 1335, 1340, 1359, 1513,
 1515, 1531, 1535, 1543, 1565, 1571, 1581, 1593, 1605,
 1708, 1714, 1725, 1733, 1824, 1826, 1828, 1829, 1862.
 Messure 317; site of a battle near Winchester. Maesuria in
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, Maxure in Wace.

MICHEL, Saint, 2540; Mont-Saint-Michel.

Middlesex 1174.

MIEPESA 2444; king of Babylon.

MODRED 2480, 2720, 2730, 2738, 2743, 2746, 2758; Arthur's nephew

Mongieu 2288, Mungieu 2376, 2429, Munoye 2718; the Great St.

Bernard.

MORTIMER 3242.

MUNTFORD 3177; Simon de Montford.

Nicol 2615; Lincoln.

Norhumbrelande 560, Norhumbrelant 618, Northumbrelande 1782, 1883; Northumberland.

Normans 3073; Normans.

Normandi 2468, Normundie 2591, 3054, 3092; Normandy.

Norreis 558, 574, 617, 767; Norweis 2034, 2465; Norsemen.

Norwales 2206; North Wales.

Norwaye 2021, 2024, 2029, Norwale 767, Norweye 338; Norway

OCTA 1062, 1437, 1467, 1756, 1772, 1777, 1879, 1889, 1898, 1906

son of Hengist

OCTAVES 299, 315, 329, 337, 352, 355; chief of a rebellion

against Constantine in Britain.

Orcheneis 2465; men of Orkney.

Orkenes 1988; Orkney

OSWALD 2873, 2877, 2879; king of Northumbria

OSWY 2879, 2881, 2885, 2887; king of Northumbria.

Paris 2072, 2076, 2148, 2164.

PASOENS 1057, 1613, 1623, 1644, 1650, PASCENT 1637, 1731; son of Vortiger.

Pasche 2164; Pask 1785; Easter.

PEANDA 2878; Penda, king of Mercia.

Poitout 2469; Poitou.

Pentecoste 2179, Pentecouste 1600; Whitsun

PHEBUS 912; Phoebus.

PHILIPPE 3162; Philip Augustus of France

Pictiens 616, 722, 783, 786, 792, 820, 839, 925; Picts

POLE 2993; St Paul's cathedral.

Porcestre 17, 19, 80, 309; Porchester, near Portsmouth.

Redding 3111; Reading.

RICHARD 3135; Richard I

RICOLF 2025, 2027; king of Norway.

Rome 102, 104, 108, 115, 212, 233, 270, 271, 275, 277, 278, 283, 303, 383, 419, 455, 467, 523, 2061, 2062, 2248, 2252, 2254, 2261, 2262, 2279, 2283, 2292, 2342, 2348, 2352, 2410, 2416, 2419, 2422, 2436, 2449, 2677, 2679, 2700, 2707, 2712, 2713, 2719, 2926.

Romein 607, 614, Romeine 320, 357, 582, 2055, 2263, 2643,

Romeines 417, 2413, Romeins 5, 28, 55, 140, 148, 197, 236

369, 1960, 2068, 2255, 2327, 2380, 2631, 2688; Roman, Romans.

ROWAN 1052, 1109, ROWEN 994, 1009, 1022, 1034, 1036; Hengist's daughter.

RUMAREC 1990; king of "Westmerland"

Salesbire 1429, 2989, Salesbirie 1139; Salisbury.

Saison 1349, Saison 1094, Saisons 1086, Saxson 1169, 1809,
 2855, Saxsons 1021, 1645, 1937, 1941, 1950, 1952, 1956
 2784, 2797, 2806, 2811, Seisson 1102, Seissons 931;
 Saxon, Saxons.
SATURNUS 912.
Saxson 874, Seisson 1116; Saxony.
Sauverne 1178, Saverne 129; Severn
Schaftsbiry 2979; Shaftesbury
Scoteis 2941; Scots
SERTORIUS 2447, 2671; king of Libya.
SEVER 201, 203; emperor Lucius Septimius Severus
Stonhenges 1609, 1687, 1928, 2774; Stonehenge.
Suongcastre 984, Suonecastre 988; "Thongcaster"
Susexe 1173; Sussex.
Suththampoun 2485; Southampton.
Suthwales 2207; South Wales.
SYMOND 3177; Simon de Montford
Tamise 493; Thames. V. p. 60.
Tamre 2748; the Tamar?
TEMORIUS 1511; Tremorius, archbishop of Caerleon.
THEODOSIEN 543; Theodosius the Great.
THOMAS 3127; Thomas à Becket
Tintagele, 1852, 1869, Tintagelle 1813, 1832; Tintagel.
Torroigne 2160; Touraine.
Totenebs 695, 1346, 1363; Totnes.
TRAHERN 286, 306, 309, 322, 331, 335, 340, 344, 345, 354;
 uncle of Eleine.
Treves 454; capital of Maximius.
Troie 2819; Troy.
ULFIN 1817, 1819, 1825; Uther's counsellor.
UROEN 2613; lord of Bath (Urgen in other versions)
URSEL 466, 482; Ursula.
UTER 717, UTHER 1357, 1539, 1545, 1616, 1639, 1641, 1691, 1706
 1722, 1726, 1732, 1744, 1769, 1781, 1862, 1877, 1885,
 1894, 1898, 1927, 1933; king of Britain.
VALENTIN 418, 542, 549, WALENTIN 466; Valentinian II.
Verolam 1897; St Albans.
VORTIGER 1858, 735, 745, 756, 762, 790, 794, 796, 800, 804, 818
 827, 834, 856, 935, 976, 1052, 1088, 1096, 1113, 1177,
 1369, 1374, 1385, 1613, WORTIGER 823, 1360; king of
 Britain.
VORTIMER 1056, 1084, 1090, 1097, 1111; son of Vortiger.
VORTIPORUS 2883; king of Britain.
WALINS 514, 515, 520, 555, 571, 610; "king of Hungary"
Waltham 3081.
Warwik 2615; Warwick.
Westmerlande 1990; ? (Wace: Guenelande L; Weneland A. Laya-
 mon: Winetland).
Westmouster 3057, 3066, 3188, 3208; Westminster.
Whitsaund 2726; Wissant
WIDER 1, 4, 12, 27; WYDER 21, 39, 56; son of Cymbeline.
WILLIAM (i) 3053, 3072, 3076, 3083, 3091, (ii) 3095; William
 I, William II.
Wincestre 84, 111, 313, 712, 746, 1636, 1745, 1755, 2922, 2934
 2951, 2990, 3028, 3040, 3167; Winchester.

PRINCIPAL WORKS CONSULTED.

Mss. of Brut. British Museum: Egerton 3028, Cotton Vitellius A. 10.

A X, Harley 6508, Royal B A XXI, Additional 32125.

Editions. Le Roux de Lincy, Rouen 1836. I. Arnold, Paris, 1937.

Other Mss: Harley 913 (Walls of New Ross), Cot, Domitian A VIII (Robert of Gloucester).

Printed Texts: Pierre de Langtoft, Holls Edition; Layamon's Brut, Madden, 1847; Munich Brut, Hofmann and Vollmuller, 1877; Caxton, Cronycles of England 1480; Short English Chronicle, Zettl, 1935; Bozon, Contes Moralises, Introd. P. Meyer, 1887; Plaintes de la Vierge, ed. Tanqueray; Fouke Fitz Warin, ed. Brandin; Song of Dermot, Orpen, 1892; Recueil de Lettres Anglo-Normandes, Tanqueray; Black Prince, ed. M.K. Pope.

For English Dialects, Middle English: English Dialect Society's publications

Baret, "Etude sur la langue anglaise au XIV^e siècle", 1883.

Emerson, O, "English or French in the Time of Edward III?" in Romanic Review, 1916.

Hogan, J.J. "English Language in Ireland," 1927.

Huchon, R. "Grammaire Historique de la Langue Anglaise".

Arthurian Material, Wace and his successors.

Aurner, S. "Hengest"; (Iowa University Humanistic Studies, v. II no. I).

Brie, F.W.D. "Der Brut oder Chronicles of England".

Bruce, J.D., "Evolution of Arthurian Romance", 1923.

Kingsford, "English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century".

Pelan, M. "Influence du Brut de Wace", 1931.

Language, Palaeography

Maitland, F.W., "Year books of Edward III", 1904.

Pope, M.K., "From Latin to Modern French", 1934; "Etude sur la langue de Frere Angier", 1903.

Prior, O., "Remarques sur l'Anglo-Normand", in Romanica, xlix;

Preface to "Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts", 1924.

Samaran, C. "La Chanson de Roland", 1933.

Studer, P., "Study of Anglo-Norman", 1920.

Tanqueray, F., "Evolution du verbe en Anglo-français", 1915.

Vising, J. "Anglo-Norman Language and Literature", 1923; "Sur la versification Anglo-Normande", 1884; "Sur le dialecte Anglo-Normand", 1882.

Wirtz, T. "Studien zur Handschrift lv 578", 1935.

Zachrisson, R., "A-N. Influence on English Place-Names", 1909.

INDEX.

- A, Latin, phonetics 78 - 83; spelling 26, 27, 90 - 92; Nasalised
 80, 94; spelling 25, 28, 30, 98, 99.
 Abridgment of Wace, 43, 47 - 55, 61, 64, 74.
 Accentuation, 152, 153.
 Additions to Wace, 43, 44 - 47, 55 - 58.
 Adjectives, agreement 126; declension 104 - 107; demonstrative
 106; numeral 105 - 6; possessive 106.
 Aethelbert, 57.
 Aethelred, 64, 69, 70, 72, 75.
 Aethelstan, 66, -68, 72.
 Aethelwolf, 66.
 Agglutination 93.
 Ai, phonetics 81; spelling 25, 91.
 Al, Latin, 80.
 Alain, 60 67.
 Alfred, 66, 69, 72, 75.
 Alliteration, 162 - 163.
 Amesbury, 26, 54, 79.
 Analogy, 93, 110, 111.
 Anglicisms, 60, 129, - 130.
 Anglo - Irish, 39, 249.
 Anlaf, 60, 67.
 Ar, Latin, 72.
 Apheresis, 100, 132.
 Arnold, 11, 44, 155, 249.
 Arsenal ms, 45, 46.
 Arthur, 10, 36, 40, 48 - 52, 55, 59, 61, 64, 75, 76.
 Articles, declension 108 - 109; syntax 126.
 Assimilation, 86, 98, 108.
 Assonance, 167, 172.
 Ast, 87, 96, 112.
 Astlepiadoc, 64.
 Au, French, 25, 80.
 Augustine, 53, 57, 59, 64.
 Author of Egerton ms, 11, 16, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50, 57, 63,
 65, 69 - 77, 78.
 B for p, 32, 34.
 Bangor, 31, 53, 59.
 Battle descriptions, 48 - 50.
 Beduer, 49, 50.
 Berkeley, 20, 29, 33, 37.
 Beverley, 66, - 68.
 Brandin, 12, 14 - 16, 21, 249.
 Britain, 42, 45, 46.
 Brittany, 53, 55.
 Brunanburgh, 67 - 68.
 Brut of Wace, 1, 4, 17, 31, 36, 43, 45 mss, 63, 64, 76, 136.
 C, spelling, 89, 94, 95.
 Cadwalader, 32, 53, 59, 65, 67.
 Cadwalan, 32, 50, 59.
 Caesura, 157, 159.
 Canute, 35, 70, 73.

Catalogue, British Museum, 4, 6, 8, 9, 35, 66, 69.
 Caxton, 20, 43, 63, 249.
 Ceremonial, 51.
 Ch, 26, 33, 95.
 Charlemagne, 2, 9, 65, 66.
 Chaucer, 19, 152 - 154, 161, 164.
 Chrétien de Troyes, 42, 51.
 Cirencester, 29, 49.
 Coel, 19, 46, 64.
 Conditional, 95, 112, 115, 116, 123, 127, 160.
 Conisborough, 9, 48.
 Conjugation, 110 - 124; change, 114, 119, 120, 121, 124, 162;
 with être, 128.
 Conjunctions, 127.
 Consonants, 25, 28, 85, phonetics, 94, spelling, 97, 112-114, 166.
 Consonnes mouillées, 88, phonetic, 97, spelling, 166.
 Constantine of Scotland, 67.
 Corrections to Wace, 59.
 Costans, 55, 104.
 Cotton¹ ms 44, 68, 73, 138, 159, 167, 249.
 D, phonetics 85; spelling 26, 28, 32, 36, 97.
 Date of ms, 5 - 6, 83.
 Declension, 100 - 109, 141, 168.
 Demonstrative adjectives, 106; pronouns 107.
 Denasalisation, 80, 94.
 Dentals, 85, 96 - 97.
 Description of ms, 1 seq. Despensers 30, 36, 37, 72, 74 - 76.
 Diphthongs, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, phonetics, 81 - 84, spelling 90, 92.
 Dissimilation, 99.
 Double vowel spellings, 25, 26, 28.
 Douglas of Glastonbury, 63.
 Dunstan, 68.
 Durham ms, 44 - 47.
 E, atonic, 84, 92-3, 137-139, 151, 158-159, 164, atonic final in
 declension, 105; in conjugation, 110, 111, 118; in versi-
 fication, 165-166; diacritic 93; irrational 93, 145, 147, 159;
 Latin, 79; nasalised, 80; spelling, 27, 91; svarabhaktio, 27,
 31, 124, 138.
 Ea, 26, 93.
 Edgar, 68-70, 72.
 Edmund Ironside, 35, 70.
 Edric, 69, 70.
 Edward the Confessor, 9, 70.
 Edward I, 71, 73; II, 37, 40, 73, 76; III, 5, 18, 38, 40, 76.
 Edward the Martyr, 69.
 Edwin, 59.
 Egbert, 65, 66.
 Ei, 25, 27, 31, 91, 115.
 Eie, 27, 30, 92.
 Elaine, 51.
 Eldolf, 10, 54, 61, 104.
 Elision, 137, 138.
 Emerson, 18, 249.
 Enclisis, 104, 144.
 English dialects, 20-24, 29, 30, 40, 58.
 English influence, -conjugation, 119, 122; language, 1899; spelling

93, 97, 131, 151; syntax, 127, 129; versification, 151, 161, 164, 173; vocabulary, 131-4.

Errors, 60, 239.

Evesham, 36, 72, 75.

Eye-rhymes, 167.

F, 31, 33, 85.

Fierabras, 1, 2, 14, 16, 17.

Fouke Fitz Warin, 21, 25, 249.

Froissart, 18, 100.

Frollo, 9, 48, 76.

Fulgenes, 48, 64.

Future, 95, 112, 122, 123.

G, 89, 93, 95.

Gaveston, 74.

Gawain, 49, 64.

Gender, 109, 125, 133.

Geoffrey of Monmouth, 42, 51, 52, 59, - 62.

Glastonbury, 36, 69, 72.

Gloucester, Gloucestershire, 29-33, 36-40, 52, 74.

Gorlois, 9, 54, 59, 61, 64, 142.

Gormond, (Gurguint) 11, 49, 52, 60.

Gower, 149, 152, 153, 161.

Groeber, 15.

Grossetete, 149.

Gurguint, v. Gormond.

Hanover ms, 12-17, 99, 118, 139, 145, 168.

Harold, 71, 75, 76.

Harold Harefoot, 70, 73.

Harthacanute, 70.

Hemistich, 157-158, 172.

Hengist, 9, 48, 50, 54, 55, 58.

Henry I, 71; II, 71, 75, 76; III, 71, 72, 75.

Heptarchy, 49, 53, 59, 65.

Hiatus, 100, 118, 120, 137, 138, 142, 152.

Higden, 19, 24.

History in the ms, 42, 65-77.

I, phonetics, 78; spelling, 27, 33.

Iambic rhythm, 155-160, 164.

Ie, conjugation, 116, 119, 120, 124; phonetics, 81-84; spelling 27, 30, 90.

Ieu, 84.

Igerne, 61.

Illustrator of ms, 11, 14, 56.

Immelmann, 63.

Imperative, 118;

Imperfect, indicative, 92, 114, 117, 121, 127, 168, 169; subjunc-

ive, 113, 117, 118, 123, 142,

Incorrect lines, proportion of, 138.

Incubi, 58.

Indicative, 111, 117, 121, 128.

Infinitive, 119.

Ingulphus, 67.

Innocent III, 72.

Intransitive verbs, 129.

Inversion, 129.

Ireland, 9, 38, 39, 48, 49, 67, 170.
 John (St), 66.sqq.
 John of Bromton, 67.
 John, King, 40, 43, 72, 73.
 Jupiter, 33, 34.
 K, 26, 95.
 Kei, 49.
 Kelham, 31, 134.
 Koch, 153.
 L, 87, 94.
 L-mouillée, 80, 88, 97.
 Langland, 163.
 Lanthony, 40.
 Latinisms, 111, 125.
 Layamon, 22, 32, 43, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62, 63, 136, 154, 163, 164.
 Le Roux de Lincy, 31, 43, 60, 129, 144, 155, 171, 172.
 Lincoln ms, 44-47.
 London, 9, 12, 47, 55, 57, 72, 73.
 Lucius, emperor, 491, 50, 61, 64.
 Luttrell, 1, 40.
 M, 88.
 Manuscripts of Brut, 44-47.
 Marius, 48.
 Merlin, 36, 48, 50, 52, 60, 62.
 Metathesis, 25, 99.
 Metrical irregularity causes, 140.
 Meyer, 19, 20, 21, 147, 150, 152, 171, 249.
 Middle English, 129, 134.
 Miniatures, 1, 2, 6sqq; 38.
 Modred, 49, 52.
 Mont-Saint-Michel giant, 19, 48.
 Montford, 36.
 Moods, 117, - 121, 128.
 Mortimer, 30, 37, 38, 74.
 Munich ms, 63, 249.
 Morphology, 100-124.
 Nasals, consonants, 88, 94; vowels, 80, 94.
 N-mouillée, 38, 88, 98.
 Nouns, declension, 100-104; syntax, 125; versification, 140.
 Numerals, 106.
 Ō, Latin, phonetics, 80; spelling, 90, 99, 166.
 Ō, Latin, phonetics, 80; spelling 90, 166.
 O, nasalised, 94.
 Oe, phonetics 80; spelling, 90, 166.
 Oi, ui, phonetics, 79; spelling 91, 92.
 Omissions from Wace, 47-55, 59.
 Origin, 16, 18-41, 74.
 Orthographia Gallica, 89, 92, 96.
 Orthography, 15, 22, 25-35, 38, 39, 78, 89-100.
 P, 86.
 Palaeographical details 2-4, 15, 239.
 Palatals, 110.

- Participles, (past) agreement, 84, 92, 96, 119, 126; forms, 78, 82-84, 86, 120, 142; (present) 119.
- Peanda, 50, 59.
- Pelan, 42, 249.
- Personal endings, verbs, 110-117. 1st pers.sing. 110, 2nd, pers. 111, 3rd.pers.sing. 111-114, 1st pers.plur. 114, 2nd pers. plur. 115, 3rd.pers. plur. 115-117.
- Personal Pronouns, 92, 107, 125.
- Phonetics, 78-88.
- Pierre de Langtoft, 25, 28, 43, 68, 73, 249.
- Plevsner, 12, 14.
- Pope, 20 80, 87, 94, 96, 129, 141, 143, 144, 152, 249.
- Possessive adjectives, 106; pronouns, 108.
- Prepositions, 126.
- Present tense, indicative, 111, 112, 117, 121, 168-169; subjunctive, 92, 111, 117, 128.
- Preterite, 89, 93, 116, 117, 122, 127, 169.
- Prior, 20, 21 23, 33, 150, 151, 152, 163, 164, 249.
- Pronouns, declension, 107-108; demonstrative, 107; indefinite 108; personal, 107; possessive, 108; reflexive, 125; relative, 108; syntax, 125; versification, 140.
- Proper nouns, 25, 60, 103.
- Proverbs, 52.
- R, 32, 95; omitted, 25, 28, 33, 80, 87, 95; double r, 95, 115, 121, 122, 123.
- Reduction in vowels, 25, 27, 30, 79.
- Reflexive pronouns, 125, 129.
- Reflexive verbs, 129.
- Relative pronouns, 108.
- Rhyme, 78, 92, 100, 164, 165-173.
- Rhythm, 100, 151, 153-162, 164.
- Richard I, 71.
- Riton, 48, 61.
- Robert of Gloucester, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 70, 75, 249.
- Robert Mannyng of Brunne, 25, 43.
- Rome Penny, 66.
- Rowena, 52, 60.
- S, conjugation 110, 111; declension, 101-108; phonetics (effacement) 86-87, 96; spelling, 28, 31, 34, 94, 96, 97.
- Saxons, 48, 49, 52, 104.
- Scotland, 48, 74, 76.
- Scots, 66, 67, 74.
- Severus, 48, 64.
- Seville ms 44-47.
- Short English Chronicle, 66, 73, 75, 249.
- Simon de Montfort, 72, 75.
- Singular and plural, confusion, 109, 118.
- Sources, 63.
- St, conjugation, 112, 113, 118; phonetics, 87, 90.
- Stephen, 71.
- Stephen Langton, 72, 75.
- Stonehenge, 9, 52.

Stress, 154, 162.
 Studer, 19, 249.
 Subject and verb, 128.
 Subjunctive, imperfect, 113, 118, 123, 142; present, 92, 111, 112, 117, 118, 128.
 Suchier, 21, 84, 119.
 Suongcastre, 29. V. Thongcaster.
 Syneresis, 120, 122, 137, 142 sqq.
 Syntax, 125-130.
 T, 85
 Tamise, 60.
 Tanqueray, 16, 23, 30, 31, 84, 118, 142, 147, 249.
 Tenses, 121, - 124; confusion, 127
 Th, 26, 32, 39.
 Thanet, 60.
 Thongcaster, 32, 52, 58.
 Tintagel, 9, 48, 51, 62.
 Trevisa, 20, 144.
 U, Latin, 80, 90.
 U, Latin, phonetics, 80; rhyme, 166; spelling, 91.
 Ui, 80, 92, 166.
 Uther, 9, 48, 51, 56, 61, 62.
 V, 26, 35, 39, 85.
 Verbal endings, 110-117, 162, 168.
 Verolam, 48, 52.
 Versification, 136-174.
 Vising, 28, 29, 30, 136, -140, 148, 150, 152, 154, 157, 164, 165, 170, 171.
 Vocabulary, 131-135.
 Vortigern, 26, 52, 55, 57, 60.
 Vortimer, 48, 60.
 Vowels, conjugation, 111, 114, 119; phonetics, 78-85; spelling, 25, 26, 28, 90-94.
 W. 26, 35, 39.
 Wace, 11, 42, 49-54, 57-59, 61, 64-66, 74, 78, 84, 127, 129, 131, 136, 138, 140, 142, 144, 157, 164, 171, 172, 249.
 West Country, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 70, 76, 95, 134.
 William I, 70, 75; II, 71.
 Winchester, 51, 71, 72, 73.
 Wirtz, 12, 14, 15, 99, 118, 139, 145, 168, 249.
 Z, 86, 96, 97, 114, 118.
 Zachrisson, 32, 249.